The 2006 Report on the Faculty Technology Survey at the University of Southern Mississippi

Faculty Responses on the Status of Technology, Technology Resources Available and Their Utilization Rate

Mary Nell McNeese, Ph. D.
July 2006

Executive Summary

PURPOSE

The administration of the 2006 Faculty Technology Survey was one measurement of the University's success in attaining the Title III-A goals and objectives over the life of the grant from 2001 to 2006. This report documents the faculty's perceptions of the initial technology needs, the interventions implemented, the impact of those interventions and finally, the current technology needs.

Additionally, this report addresses both the current technology resources, services and support that actually exist on all Southern Miss campuses and to what extent these technology resources, services and support are utilized by faculty, staff and students (Appendix B). These will be compared and contrasted to the faculty's perceptions of the resources, services, and support. If faculty are unaware of available resources, services and support, a marketing opportunity exists. If needed resources, services and support are unavailable, evaluation and planning opportunities exist.

METHODOLOGY

In 2006, 680 Survey questionnaires were campus-mailed to faculty on all University campuses with a letter from the Provost encouraging participation; 127 usable surveys were returned (for a response rate of 18.68%). The 2001, 2004 and 2006 Faculty Technology Survey instruments are included in Appendix C of this report for comparative purposes. The 2006 Survey replicated the 109 items from the 2004 instrument and added three new items: item 17 ("I am better able to use information technology now than I was five years ago."), item109 ("Did you take this survey in January 2004, the second time it was administered?"), and item 110 ("Have you been employed by The University of Southern Mississippi since January 2004, or have you been promoted from a staff or student position to a faculty position since January 2004?"). These items were necessary to complete longitudinal assessment. Also the college identification numbers, present on both the 2001 and the 2004 Surveys, were removed from the 2006 Survey and were inserted by the Center for Research Support based on the departmental codes furnished by the participants on their Scantron answer sheets. The Likert scale response "Neither Agree or Disagree" on the 2001 and 2004 Surveys was revised to "Neutral" on the 2006 Survey.

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF TECHNOLOGY

In 2006, the perceived barriers to technology used by faculty at Southern Miss included these issues: **Availability, Cost, Incentive/Effort, Skills/Knowledge, Support, and Time.** Yet, more than 85% of the faculty reported that their technology skills had grown over the last five years.

There were only two significant gender differences in faculty perceptions of technology in 2006. First, female faculty were less aware that they needed to use technological facilities in their teaching. Second, when male faculty needed technological support, they described iTech support as less helpful and unresponsive to their needs than their female counterparts.

DEFINED OVERALL NEEDS

While most faculty felt they were becoming more capable users of technology over time, they still had not learned everything they wanted to learn. Faculty reported that they did not have adequate access to the technology that they would like to use either in their offices, their homes, or their classrooms. Faculty expressed the desire to use multimedia classrooms but stated demand exceeded supply. When faculty used the multimedia classrooms, many of them reported equipment problems, problems with the rooms' physical environment and a lack of on-site technical support. Approximately half of the participating faculty members reported that they were familiar with the information technology services at Southern Miss and those services were quite helpful and responsive to their needs; however, only a third of those respondents felt that their technology needs were "very adequately met." This could indicate that the faculty desired to learn more about technology, and to acquire more office, home and classroom technology access.

PERCEIVED SKILL AND USE LEVELS OF TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES

MS Word, MS PowerPoint, data projectors/laptops/computers/televisions, MS Excel, and ListServs were the five top technology resources in which faculty were skilled. The five top ranked technology resources according to use levels were: MS Word, MS PowerPoint, MS Excel, data projectors/laptops/computer/televisions, and equipment in the Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUCs). Based on these reports of faculty skill and use levels, almost all related Title III-A Grant goals and objectives were either met or exceeded.

CONCLUSIONS

In 2006, half of the faculty sampled report out-of-date hardware and the lack of technology in their classrooms. Departmental funding for hardware and software has diminished with state budget cuts. Fewer incentive programs purchase hardware, software or faculty release time to learn new technologies. Table 4 is a prioritized list of technology resources that can inform Departments, iTech, Equipment Services, and University Administrators as they make decisions on what additional resources will be purchased and supported, given the scarcity of funding available.

Faculty still report being more skilled in technology than they were five years ago and most faculty believed they knew what technology resources were available but needed more resources, training and on-site tech support. The utilization rates in Appendix B do show a high rate of resources in use.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **LEC:** LEC should seek innovative ways of evaluating what hardware and software training faculty need. One possibility would be to survey or conduct a focus group with the Title III-A faculty mentors regarding the needs in their departments/schools/colleges. LEC should encourage Title III-A Faculty

Technology Mentors to provide on-site training and support to their fellow faculty, whenever possible. These mentors should model the exploration of new hardware and software beyond the MS Office Suite applications, to which most faculty are limited. The Technology Teas, trade exhibits for instructional technology equipment and software sponsored by commercial vendors, should be continued and expanded to accomplish this. LEC should make special note of the following when planning training: Table 9: Ranked List of Barriers to Using the Technology Applications and Media that Faculty Would Like to Use Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates, Table 10: Ranked List of Faculty Needs/Concerns Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates, and Table 11: Ranked List of Technology Functions Faculty Would Like to Use if Supported Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates. The Technology Brown Bag Series should be expanded, utilizing more of the Technology Mentors. Finally, LEC could set up focus groups with faculty who do not see the value of using technology in their teaching.

- **iTech:** iTech should persist in resolving internet and network access issues and establish a systematic plan to renew hardware. Secondly, iTech should continue to market the availability of existing campus resources and support services to the faculty, particularly new faculty members during their orientation period. iTech's electronic newsletters [http://www.usm.edu/itech/news/index.html] are a proven method of accomplishing this. Furthermore, iTech should continue to focus on customer service issues by seeking avenues of dialogue with faculty who may not have participated in the Technology Survey(s). iTech should especially focus on unresolved support issues, such as student lab access to software such as SPSS statistical software, which is used in teaching statistics to students from all 5 colleges. iTech may need to initiate the involvement of the University Administration to resolve some of these issues. Finally, while the University has conducted 3 faculty technology surveys, there have been no surveys of the staff and student perceptions of technology. It is recommended that iTech consider administering such surveys.
- **DEAL:** DEAL should maintain its focus on customer support for Web-related instruction, particularly as WebCT software upgrades to version 6.0 are being implemented during the spring semester of 2007. DEAL should market the new capabilities of WebCT, version 6 such as electronic portfolios, which are recommended for use by both NCATE and SACS.
- **COX and COOK LIBRARIES:** The libraries should consider expanding their "Lunch and a Workshop" series to provide workshops for faculty who wish to conduct research on the Web. It is also recommended that the Libraries continue to offer to departmental research workshops for faculty, graduate teaching and research assistants. Workshop requests are accessible online at: http://www.lib.usm.edu/instruction/BIrequest.php .

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Purpose and Methodology

Purpose of the Report

The 2001 Faculty Technology Survey was administered to assess the faculty's perception of the status of campus technology as compared with the educational hardware and software available to them at that time. The results of that survey provided information which was used to secure and support external funding for the Preparing Mississippi's Teachers to Use Technology (PT^3) and the Title III-A Strengthening Institutions grants from the United States Department of Education. Additionally, the assessment supplemented evidence maintained by the Professional Education Unit and the University's Institutional Effectiveness Office which documents compliance for accreditation purposes.

The results of the 2004 Survey supplied summative evaluation for the PT^3grant while providing formative evaluation for the Title III-A grant. The results informed administrative decisions in instructional technology hardware and software acquisitions and faculty technology development efforts.

The administration of the 2006 Survey measures the University's success in attaining the Title III-A goals and objectives over the life of the grant. It documents the impact of the interventions implemented.

Additionally, this report addresses both the technology resources, services and support that actually exist on all Southern Miss campuses and to what extent these are utilized by faculty, staff and students (Appendix B). The available resources, services and support will be compared and contrasted to the faculty's perceptions of them. Where faculty might be unaware of available resources, services and support, a marketing opportunity exists. If needed resources, services and support are unavailable, evaluation and planning opportunities exist.

Methodology

The 2001 Survey[1] was primary designed to meet the needs of the PT^3 and the Title III-A grants. Dr. J. T. Johnson, Director of the Center for Research Support (CRS), assisted the ad hoc committee of Mr. Eddie Williams and Drs. Susan Malone and Lin Harper in the development of the Survey. Drs. Lin Harper and Mary Nell McNeese revised the 2004 and 2006 surveys. Eight hundred eighty-four questionnaires were campus-mailed to all members of the faculty and the administration on all Southern Miss campuses. The Provost provided a letter to encourage participation in the project. The response rate was 30.3% (268 usable surveys). The CRS scanned the data into an SPSS file for analysis purposes.

In 2004, 750 questionnaires were sent to the faculty at all university campuses. A letter from the Provost was again included in the survey packet; 199 usable surveys were returned (for a response rate of 26.53%). Finally, in 2006, 680 questionnaires were

campus-mailed to faculty on all University campuses with an updated letter from the Provost encouraging participation; 127 usable surveys were returned (for a response rate of 18.68%). As in 2001 and 2004, the University's CRS scanned the 2006 data into an SPSS file for data analyses.

The 2001 Survey contained 56 items. The 2004 and 2006 Surveys were designed to replicate as many items as possible from the 2001 Survey to enable longitudinal analyses over the life of the Title III-A grant.

The 2004 Survey replicated 56 items from the 2001 instrument and added two item sets and four individual items. These additional items were designed to provide feedback on interventions implemented since the 2001 Survey.

The first item set assessed whether faculty would use certain technology features if they could easily obtain support. Faculty were asked if the existing training support met their requirements. The second set measured the faculty's perception of their skill and use levels of the WebCT, ListServ, Web Designing software, Microsoft Word, Microsoft Excel, PowerPoint, Microsoft Access, Microsoft Access, Microsoft Photoshop, Adobe Distiller, Adobe Page Maker, Adobe Illustrator, Quick Time Movies, Equipment in the Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms, Video data projector use with laptop, computer, television, and SPSS use.

The four individual items added to the 2004 Survey were: item 16 ("The cost of the software applications that I use for instruction is high."), item 30 ("In the classrooms I use, I need but do not have: audio and video capabilities."), item 107 ("Did you take this survey in August 2001 when it was first administered?"), and item 108 ("Have you been employed by The University of Southern Mississippi since August 2001, or have you been promoted from a staff or student position to a faculty position since August 2001?").

The 2006 Survey replicated the 109 items from the 2004 instrument and added three new items: item 17 ("I am better able to use information technology now than I was five years ago."), item109 ("Did you take this survey in January 2004, the second time it was administered?"), and item 110 ("Have you been employed by The University of Southern Mississippi since January 2004, or have you been promoted from a staff or student position to a faculty position since January 2004?") . These items were necessary to complete longitudinal assessment. Also the identification number for the colleges on both the 2001 and the 2004 Surveys was removed from the 2006 Survey then was inserted by the Center for Research Support based on the departmental code furnished by each participant on the Scantron answer sheet. In 2006, the Likert scale response "Neither Agree or Disagree" was revised to "Neutral."

The Surveys gathered descriptive data on the samples such as; academic rank, department, college (except in 2006, when department code was used to code college), campus, age, and gender. There were some missing data in each data collection, especially in the 2006 wave. This may be attributed to several factors. Some faculty may be uncomfortable disclosing information which may identify them, such as rank or gender. Additionally, in the researcher's zeal to get the Survey out into the hands of faculty and administrators, we inadvertently left out the Annexure of department and campus codes. The Annexure was quickly placed on Faculty-Staff ListServ, sent to all deans/chairs/directors for distribution, and emailed to anyone who contacted us. In the 2006 data, almost 6% of the faculty did not report their ages, 47% did not report their

department (and therefore their college), 58% did not report their campus, and 11% did not report their academic rank or their gender.

Breakdown of Responses

While the return rate was lower than was expected, the researchers believe that reliable information can be obtained from the survey since the survey reliability, as assessed by Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha equaled .90, which is acceptable. While 11% of the faculty did not report their ***academic rank***, there was a good distribution of responses among ranks, particularly among the tenure-track professors.

Table 1: Summary of Responses by Academic Rank

Rank	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=127)
Missing Data	14	11
Instructor	18	14
Visiting Professor	6	6
Adjunct/Part-time Professor	1	.8
Assistant Professor	33	26
Associate Professor	26	20
Professor	29	23

The breakdown by ***department/college*** contained the highest level of missing data in the 2006 Survey with 53% of faculty reporting and 47% not reporting. For the purpose of maintaining anonymity for small departments, this information will be reported only at the college level. The College of Education and Psychology faculty participated to a higher degree than any other college and faculty from the College of Business and Economic Development were the least likely to participate in the Survey.

Table 2: Summary of Responses by College

College	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=127)
Missing Data	60	47
College of Arts and Letters	16	13
College of Business and Economic Development	4	3
College of Health	11	9
College of Science and Technology	16	13
College of Education and Psychology	20	16

The breakdown by ***age*** contained the least missing data. A total of 120 faculty members reported their age, with only 7 faculty members failing to respond to that item. The mean age was 48.81 years, with a minimum age of 29 and a maximum age of 69. The standard deviation for age was almost 10. This mean was just below the mean for the 2004 Survey but above the mean for the 2001 Survey. Faculty aged 51-60 were the most likely to report and faculty aged 21-30 were the least likely to report.

The breakdown by ***gender*** showed the same level of missing data as academic rank, which may have displayed the right to protect anonymity. Slightly more male faculty than female faculty disclosed their gender in 2006, which is the same response pattern as was noted in the 2001 and the 2004 Surveys.

Table 3: Summary of Responses by Age and Gender

Age Intervals	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=127)
Missing Data	7	6
21-30	3	2
31-40	26	21
41-50	32	25
51-60	45	35
61-70	14	11
Gender		
Missing Data	14	11
Female	55	43
Male	58	46

Score Interpretations and Scale

As you read the data results, you will notice that some of the number of participants in some of the items will vary slightly. The reason for this is that, for some items, respondents would indicate their age, for example, but not their academic rank. When the data were analyzed or grouped based upon age, that particular respondent would be included in the data; however, when the information were grouped based upon academic rank, that respondent would *not* be included in the data since he/she did not indicate academic rank. The Survey results were tallied based upon a **Likert scale** of 0-5:

0 = Not Applicable
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Somewhat Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Somewhat Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Although the answer choices on the Survey were the same as the Likert scale of 0-5 listed above, the Survey results for items 78-107 were tallied and interpreted based upon the **Likert scale** of 0-3 listed below so that they were compatible with the 2004 data:

0 = Not Relevant
1 = Minimal
2 = Moderate
3 = Very High

No scores of "0" were reported in the 2001, the 2004 nor the 2006 data. The items were answered in most cases, although there are some missing data. For the purposes of establishing a mid-range score for the data, the center score of "3" was chosen. Scores above "3" will be interpreted as agreement and scores below "3" will be interpreted as disagreement.

In the 2006 Survey, some items were stated in the opposite way than the other items in the same category. Item 1 stated "There are no barriers to my using the applications and media I would like to use." Since this item was worded positively and the following 15 items (Items 2-16) were worded negatively, item 1 was reverse-coded so that it would be interpretable when compared to the other barrier items. Items 23-31 were worded negatively, and were therefore reverse-coded so that they would be interpretable when compared to the other attitudinal items (Items 17-22 and 32-39), which were worded positively. When analyzing this data longitudinally, the same reverse-coding will be utilized when analyzing these same items. A copy of the 2001, 2004, and the 2006 Surveys are in Appendix C of this report.

---

[1]The Faculty Technology Survey administered in 2001, 2004, and 2006 was modeled on the 1999 University of Michigan Faculty Survey developed by Dr. Carl Berger, professor and dean emeritus. A blank copy of that survey and its results can be accessed at: http://sitemaker.umich.edu/cberger/reports__articles . Copies of the 2001, 2004, and 2006 surveys used at USM are included in Appendix C of this report.

Chapter 2

Faculty Perceptions of Technology

Perceived Barriers to Technology Use

The perceived barriers to technology use by faculty at Southern Miss will be gauged through specific items grouped in the following categories below: **Availability, Cost, Incentive/Effort, Skills/Knowledge, Support, and Time.** In reacting to the overarching statement ("There are no barriers to my using the applications and media I would like to use", a total of 57.7% expressed disagreement, indicating that the majority perceives that there were no barriers which actually prevented their technology use. The mean for item 1 was 3.34, with a standard deviation of 1.27 (n = 123).

Availability (Items # 8, 9, 10): Few faculty (12.6%) reported that they did not use technology because they did not know how to get access it. Nor did they feel that having applications and media which would not run on the machines in the computing sites hindered their technology use (24.5% agreement). More faculty (51.2%) asserted that out of date hardware and the unavailability of technology in their classrooms (55.9%) were the barriers which most prevented their effective use of technology. Comparing the 2006 to the 2004 sample, improvement in availability was reported. From 2001 through 2006, most hardware/software purchases were funded either at the department level or through grants. The feasibility of centralized hardware/software acquisition for faculty has been considered by iTech.

Cost (Items # 7, 14, 16): The largest percentage of the faculty (68.6%) perceived that departmental funds to pay for software costs were unavailable. Approximately one-third (37.8%) of the faculty found the cost of the software applications high enough to hinder them from using that instructional software. Only 24.4% of the faculty reported that the expense of technology prevented them from using the applications and media they would like to use. While a greater percentage of the 2006 faculty report the lack of departmental funds to buy software, the percentage of the faculty who indicated that the cost of applications and media were a barrier decreased over the 2004-2006 period. State funding to the University has been cut considerably during the period in which this survey pertains. Departments have had to carefully decide how to expend funds efficiently and it may have been, in some cases, funding for software had to be decreased.

Incentive/Effort (Items #13, 15): Almost one-third of the faculty (30.3%) didn't use the technology they would like to use because it was just too much trouble. Around 70% of the faculty did not perceive that there were any incentive programs (e.g. leave time, contribution toward tenure, or financial rewards) associated with technology use. About the same number of faculty in 2004 and 2006 felt that using technology was too much trouble. A much higher increase in percentage of the faculty (from 56% to 70%) were unaware of incentive programs/rewards linked to technology integration in 2006. This finding was surprising given the many incentive programs/rewards offered to faculty through the PT^3 and Title III-A mini-grants as well as the Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards.

Skills/Knowledge (Items # 3, 6, 12): Even by 2006, 41.7% of the faculty reporting felt that they had not acquired the necessary skills to use their desired technology. While this is a decrease from the 50% reported in 2004, it is only a slight reduction. This could indicate that an already technologically skilled faculty craves a higher level of knowledge and skill. The 2004-

2006 trend shows steady growth in the acquisition of new skills and knowledge which would enable faculty to use the technology they aspire to use in their teaching. Future LEC training should continue to lead the faculty to develop new technology skills, and to update their skills as new versions of applications and media become available. A slightly smaller percentage of the 2006 faculty (14.3%) reported they didn't know how to integrate those skills into their classroom instruction than those who reported that result in 2004 (16.3%). Therefore, professional development in faculty technology integration appears to have made almost 86% of the faculty comfortable with those skills. While 64.1% of the faculty reported that they did not know how to legally use copyrighted materials in 2004, only 18.4% of faculty members reported that lack of that knowledge in 2006. This dramatic decrease can be credited in part to the copyright and intellectual property workshop which LEC offered in February, 2006.

Support (Items # 4, 5): In 2006, only 29.6% of the faculty reported that technical support was unavailable to them on campus. While a much higher percentage (49.6) of the faculty are hindered from using the technology they want to use because they perceive that they did not have on-site (e.g. classroom or lab) support. While fewer faculty in 2004 expressed support issues (no campus tech support = 28.1%; no on-site support = 48.1%) compared to 2001 (no campus tech support = 40.5%; no on-site support = 67.6%), a higher percentage of the 2006 faculty are aware of both overall campus and on-site technical support. Since 2001, Southern Miss has experienced two Chief Technology Officers (CTOs), one Chief Information Officer (CIO), three University Presidents, and multiple other changes in administrative, faculty, and staff positions. While these transitions may have posed some temporary constraints, one of the few constants in the information technology area was the focus on customer service. Each successive reorganization brought the University to a higher awareness and a more detailed plan of how to achieve a higher level of customer satisfaction and problem resolution. Based on the response of the 2006, over 70% of the faculty agree the planning and implementation have paid off.

Time (Item # 2): Nearly 32% of the faculty reported they didn't have time to use the technology applications and media that they would like to use. This percentage is higher than the comparison group in 2004 (16.3%). This could be a reflection of the time required for other priorities such as personal and professional recovery from Hurricane Katrina in August, 2005.

Perceived Growth in Technology Use

Items 17 and 18 measured faculty attitudes towards technology in comparative terms. Faculty were asked to reflect on how their technology use had changed from the start to the mid-point of the Title III-A grant and again, from the mid-point to the end of the grant.

***Item 17:* I am better able to use technology that I was five years ago.** A total of 85.7% of the sampled faculty believe that they are more competent in technology use than they were five years ago. Since one of the Title III-A project objectives (Activity 2: Faculty Professional Development, Objective 1) stated in part that:
"By 2006, 50% of the faculty will report adequate skill levels in basic technology applications and instructional equipment operation…" it is indeed exciting that a substantially higher percentage confirm that their technology skills have increased! The professional development offered through the PT^3 grant, LEC and iTech has proven effective in faculty technology training.

***Item 18:* I am better able to use technology that I was two years ago.** Nearly 75% of the 2006 faculty testify that their technology skills have improved over the last two years. The fact that this outcome is slightly lower than the previous one may be explained by a number of factors including: faculty had already become highly skilled by

2004 and so had less room to expand their technology skills (the ceiling effect) and the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, which could have diverted faculty attention away from acquiring additional technology skills since their spare time might have been spent on personal and professional recovery efforts.

Gender Differences on Perceptions of Technology

There were no statistically significant gender differences on the perceptions of technology as measured by items 1-16. Using the Bonferroni Correction to reduce incidences of Type 1 errors, two-tailed *t*-tests on items 1-16 were not significant at the $p \leq .003$ level. Although there are slight numerical differences in faculty perceptions of technology by gender, the means are statistically equal. This indicates that the perceptions of technology on the Southern Miss campus are essentially the same regardless of the faculty member's gender.

There were two significant gender differences on the faculty attitudes towards technology and overall needs as measured by items 17-39; items 23 and 39 were significant at the $p \leq .003$ level. Female faculty answers for items 23 ("I do not need any technological facilities in the classrooms I use.") and 39 ("Southern Miss' information technology support services have been very helpful and responsive to my needs.") were significantly higher than male faculty answers. This indicates that female faculty are significantly less aware of any need to use technological facilities in their teaching. LEC should be aware of this result when planning professional development so that they can insure that female faculty have ample opportunities to explore the advantages of integrating technology into their teaching. In addition, the results indicate that when male faculty have needed technological support, they have found iTech support to be less helpful and responsive than female faculty. This may afford iTech the opportunity to explore the reasons why male faculty feel more alienated so that measures can be implemented to reverse this negative perception.

The frequencies and percentages for all Survey items appear in Appendix A. These statistics include the number of faculty responding to each, and the number of missing data points for each item.

Chapter 3

Defined Overall Needs

Specific Needs

Items 4, 8, 13-16, 19-39 assessed the faculty's needs and concerns related to technology resources, training, and support. Percentages will be used to clarify and interpret these needs and concerns.

Technical Support (Items 4 and 39): Almost half of the faculty (46.6%) stated that they were aware of campus technical support (Item 4). A higher percentage of faculty (55.2%) agreed that iTech support services had been very helpful and responsive to their needs (Item 39). Some faculty were unaware technical support was available on campus but those who were aware were basically satisfied customers. iTech should consider ways to market the availability of support services to the faculty, particularly new faculty members during their orientation period.

Lack of technology in the classroom (Items 10, and 22-31): Almost 60% of the faculty indicated unavailable technology in their classrooms hinders them from using the applications and media they would like to use (Item 10). Only one-fourth of the faculty felt that they taught in classrooms that were technologically fitted for their needs (Item 22). Although the Title III-A grant has increased the campus technology facilities substantially (See Appendix B.), faculty needs are still perceived as unmet in this area. In some cases, it may be that faculty are now more knowledgeable about facilities that could be acquired to better meet their students' needs. In other instances, faculty are now more skilled and so are capable of using a higher level technological facility than they were five years ago. Regardless of the reason, technology facility demand still exceeded campus supply; indeed, almost 85% of the faculty needed technology facilities (Item 23). As stated in Item 22, not only did faculty need the facilities they currently have, they actually needed expanded facilities.

If faculty state their demand for technology facilities exceeds demand, the next logical step is to investigate what specific information technology resources faculty lack in their classrooms:

Item 24: ***Internet access***-Around 35% of the faculty stated that they did not have necessary Internet access.

Item 25: ***Network connections***-Nearly 33% of the faculty members needed, but did not have, network connections.

Item 26: ***Computer projection capabilities***-Over half of the faculty reported that they lacked the computer projection capabilities that they needed.

Item 27: ***Lapel microphone***-Forty percent of the faculty stated the need for a lapel microphone.

Item 28: ***Electronic pointers***-Almost half of the faculty needed, but did not have, an electronic pointer.

Item 29: Student computers-Fifty-two and a half percent of the faculty reported that they needed student computers which were unavailable to them.

Item 30: Instructor's computer station-Half of the faculty reported that they needed, but did not have an instructor's computer station.

Item 31: Audio and Video capabilities-Nearly 58% of the faculty would like to use audio and video capabilities that they perceive are unavailable for their use.

The preceding list of resources could be prioritized as follows: audio/video capabilities, student computers, computer projection capabilities, instructor's computer stations, electronic pointers, lapel microphones, Internet access and network connections. This prioritized list of needs can inform departments, iTech, and Equipment Services as they make decisions on what additional resources will be purchased and supported.

Accessibility (Items 8, 20-21, and 24): The base item (Item 8) was whether of not faculty knew how to get access. Approximately 51.4% indicated that they were knowledgeable enough about access to use the applications and media they wanted to use. Around 40% of faculty, from all campus sites, report that they can access needed computing resources from their offices; indeed, that percentage falls to 25 when the report is from faculty on the Gulf Coast campuses alone (Item 20), while only about 15% reported adequate home access (Item 21). The effects of Hurricane Katrina adversely affected (especially the Gulf Coast) faculty's ability to access needed resources either in their offices or at home. In a survey conducted by Gulf Coast Faculty Council, most faculty members lost their offices including their computing equipment and many still did not have private office space when the 2006 Survey was administered. Even Hattiesburg faculty lost computing resources as a result of that hurricane. University administrators and iTech are currently assessing what resources need to be replaced and negotiating with insurers to restore the devastated resources that faculty need in their offices.

Just over 16% of faculty overall (12.5% of Gulf Coast faculty) convey that their home access to Southern Miss computing resources is adequate (Item 22). As was discussed in the prior item, the negative aftermath of Hurricane Katrina is a likely cause. Most Gulf Coast faculty were displaced by the storm and a large percentage of Hattiesburg faculty sustained at least minor home damage. Since many faculty sustained uninsured losses, this home access may build back slowly.

The faculty told us that 65% have internet access in their classrooms (Item 24). While Internet access is higher than was reported in 2004, the home and office access is substantially lower. This decrease, at least at home, is possibly related to home and computer damage during Hurricane Katrina. The decrease in office access might be attributed to technical problems related to faculty moving to different offices and transitioning to a campus-wide wireless network. While the wireless internet is quite stable over most of the campus, older buildings like Owens-McQuagge Hall, continue to require a disproportionate amount of technical support and troubleshooting.

Availability of IT Resources (Items 19, 37-38): Only 25.2 % of the faculty state they are able to do what they need or want to do using the University's information technology resources. While faculty do believe that they are able to use technology better than they could two to five years ago, they desire more. This finding supports the need for LEC to continue to enlarge training through Expanding Excellence and other professional development programs. Items 24 to 31 above listed specific resources faculty perceived they needed but did not have available.

Just over half of the faculty stated that they were very familiar with campus information technology resources (Item 37). This percentage has grown consistently since 2001, indicating that faculty are becoming increasingly aware of the resources available to them. A third of the faculty agreed that the perceived campus resources very adequately met their needs (Item 38). Basically, they know what's available, but they seek more resources and the training to fully utilize those resources.

Multimedia Classrooms (Items 32-36): Almost 46% of the faculty tried to reserve a media-rich classroom (Item 32). However, only about 15% of the faculty have been able to reserve those classrooms. Faculty have also recounted problems with: the multimedia equipment (75%), the room's physical environment (67%), and on-site technical support (75%) [Items 34-36, respectively].

In summary, while most faculty feel that they are becoming more capable users of technology over time, they still have not learned everything they want to learn about using technology. Faculty reported they do not have adequate access to the technology they would like to use in their offices, their homes, nor their classrooms. Faculty expressed the desire to use multimedia classrooms but state that demand exceeds supply. Although faculty tried to use the multimedia classrooms, many reported equipment problems, problems with the rooms' physical environment and a lack of on-site technical support. Approximately half of the participating faculty members report that they are familiar with our IT services, finding them quite helpful and responsive to their needs. Only a third of the sample considers their technology needs adequately met. Faculty desire to learn more about technology, and to acquire more office, home and classroom technology access.

Table 4: Ranked List of Specific Faculty Technology Needs and Concerns

Classroom Needs and Concerns	% Strongly Agree	% Somewhat Agree	Total % Agreement
24. Internet Access	30.9	28.5	59.4
39. Southern Miss' iTech Support Services responsiveness to needs	20.8	34.4	55.2
25. Network Access	27.9	27	54.9
30. Instructor's Computer Station	32.5	17.5	50
32. Attempted to Reserve Multimedia Classroom	37.7	8.2	45.9
37. Familiarity with iTech Resources on Campus	11.9	40.5	43.9
26. Computer Projection Capabilities	23	18	41
28. Electronic Pointers	19.8	19	38.8
27. Lapel Microphone	23.3	14.7	38
31 Audio and Video Capabilities	16.3	16.3	32.6
29. Student Computers	21.2	11	32.2
38. Southern Miss' iTech Resources Meet my Needs Very Adequately	5.6	26.2	31.8
35. Multimedia Room's Physical Environment	13	18.3	31.3
36. Multimedia On-Site Technical Support	12.2	13.9	26.1
34. The Multimedia Equipment	8.6	15.5	24.1

33. Always Able to Reserve a Multimedia Classroom without problems	**5.2**	**9.6**	**14.8**

Functions Faculty Would Use if Support Were Readily Available

The even numbered items (40-76) addressed what technologies faculty would like to use if supported, while the odd numbered items (41-77) dealt with whether existing training support met their requirements.

Table 5: Ranked List of Technology Functions Faculty Would Use if Supported

Tech. Functions	% Strongly Agree	% Somewhat Agree	Total % Agreement
56. Use multimedia presentations	**49.2**	**35**	**84.2**
46. Use audio/video clips, animation, or slides	**54.5**	**29.3**	**83.8**
42. Use an e-mail list of student in my class	**62.8**	**20.7**	**83.5**
58. Use the Web to conduct research	**58**	**24.4**	**82.4**
40. Use a Web page with course materials	**54.7**	**24.8**	**79.5**
72. Use the Web for online materials archives	**40.7**	**31.4**	**72.1**
66. Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people at Southern Miss	**30.3**	**37**	**67.3**
70. Use the Web to gather information via online quizzes, etc.	**35**	**31.6**	**66.6**
68. Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world	**31.1**	**30.3**	**61.4**
44. Use a class electronic bulletin board/forum on the Web	**33.9**	**25.6**	**59.5**
48. Use streaming video	**19.2**	**40**	**59.2**
62. Use the Web to present work to people around the world	**35.8**	**22.5**	**58.3**
76. Use the Web for online course delivery	**34.7**	**22**	**56.7**
60. Use the Web to present work to other people at Southern Miss	**36.1**	**17.6**	**53.7**
54. Use self-paced tutorials with audio/video clips	**27.1**	**26.3**	**53.4**
50. Use self-paced practice and tests of routine tasks	**28.3**	**21.7**	**50**
52. Use computer simulations	**26.9**	**22.7**	**49.6**
64. Use the Web to conduct simulations or visualizations	**27.1**	**19.5**	**46.6**

Table 6: Ranked List of Technology Functions for Which Faculty Believe Existing Training Support Meets Their Requirements

Tech. Functions	% Strongly Agree	% Somewhat Agree	Total % Agreement
56. Use multimedia presentations	49.2	35	84.2
46. Use audio/video clips, animation, or slides	54.5	29.3	83.8
42. Use an e-mail list of student in my class	62.8	20.7	83.5
58. Use the Web to conduct research	58	24.4	82.4
40. Use a Web page with course materials	54.7	24.8	79.5
72. Use the Web for online materials archives	40.7	31.4	72.1
66. Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people at Southern Miss	30.3	37	67.3
70. Use the Web to gather information via online quizzes, etc.	35	31.6	66.6
68. Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world	31.1	30.3	61.4
44. Use a class electronic bulletin board/forum on the Web	33.9	25.6	59.5
48. Use streaming video	19.2	40	59.2
62. Use the Web to present work to people around the world	35.8	22.5	58.3
76. Use the Web for online course delivery	34.7	22	56.7
60. Use the Web to present work to other people at Southern Miss	36.1	17.6	53.7
54. Use self-paced tutorials with audio/video clips	27.1	26.3	53.4
50. Use self-paced practice and tests of routine tasks	28.3	21.7	50
52. Use computer simulations	26.9	22.7	49.6
64. Use the Web to conduct simulations or visualizations	27.1	19.5	46.6

Chapter 4

Perceived Faculty Skill Level and Use of Technology Resources

Specific Skills and Use

Items 78-107 called for self-assessment of both skill and actual rate of usage of certain technology resources. The even items related to skill assessment while the odd items related to the use assessment.

Table 7: Ranked List of Faculty Skill Level in Certain Information Technology Resources

Tech. Resources	% Strongly Agree	% Somewhat Agree	Total % Agreement
84. Microsoft Word	62.8	26.4	89.2
88. Microsoft PowerPoint	46.3	35.5	81.8
104. Data projector, laptop, computer, television	36.4	37.2	73.6
86. Microsoft Excel	38.7	32.8	71.5
80. LISTSERV	25	23.3	48.3
102. Equipments in HVUCs	24.3	20.9	45.2
78. WebCT	15.1	27.7	42.8
106. Using SPSS	16.7	24.2	40.9
82. Web Designing software	9.2	20	29.2
92. Microsoft Photoshop	10.9	17.6	28.5
94. Adobe Distiller	14.4	12.7	27.1
90. Microsoft Access	12	10.3	22.3
100. Quick Time Movies	10.3	11.1	21.4
96. Adobe Page Maker	7.7	6	13.7
98. Adobe Illustrator	5.1	3.4	8.5

Table 8: Ranked List of Faculty Use Level in Certain Information Technology Resources

Tech. Resources	% Strongly Agree	% Somewhat Agree	Total % Agreement
85. Microsoft Word	72.7	19.8	92.5
89. Microsoft PowerPoint	50.4	24	74.4
87. Microsoft Excel	41.2	31.9	73.1
105. Data projector, laptop, computer, television	40.5	29.8	70.3
103. Equipments in HVUCs	25.2	19.1	44.3
81. LISTSERV	20.8	22.5	43.3
107. Using SPSS	17.6	27.7	42.8
79. WebCT	22.9	16.1	39
83. Web Designing software	12.5	17.5	30
93. Microsoft Photoshop	17.1	9.4	26.5
95. Adobe Distiller	17.1	9.4	26.5
91. Microsoft Access	12.8	6	18.8
101. Quick Time Movies	8.5	10.3	18.8
97. Adobe Page Maker	8.5	5.1	13.6
99. Adobe Illustrator	6	5.1	11.1

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

The 2006 Survey is one measurement of the University's success in attaining the Title III-A goals and objectives over the life of the grant. It documents the overwhelming successes of Co-Principal Investigators, Drs. Cynthia Moore and Lin Harper, in meeting the challenges of strengthening the human and materials resources at Southern Miss. The grant goals and objectives are listed below, matched with their measured results:

Title III-A Grant Goals and Objectives

Activity I: Purchase of Equipment to Improve Academic Programs

Objective 1

By 2002, assess the state of readiness of existing classrooms used for "highly visible undergraduate programs" for the incorporation of educational technology related to instruction.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule. Using information primarily from the departmental chairs and deans, 38 classrooms in "highly visible undergraduate programs" were identified; then these classrooms were inspected to ascertain what equipment should be acquired and what physical adaptations might be necessary to make that equipment fully operational.

Objective 2

During 2002-2006, 75% to 100% of the classrooms used for "highly visible undergraduate programs" will be adapted for multimedia instruction.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule. While at least 40 classrooms (some additional ones were funded by college deans) were adapted for multimedia instruction, only approximately 36 remain after Hurricane Katrina.

Objective 3

By 2006, a minimum of 60% of USM faculty will report being "satisfied" to "very satisfied" with available classroom technologies.

Results

In item 35 ("Southern Miss' information technology resources meet my needs very adequately."), approximately 30.1% of the faculty had reported being "satisfied" to "very satisfied" in 2001. This increased in 2006 to 31.8% of the faculty report being "satisfied" to "very satisfied"; however, this percentage was slightly lower than the response to the same item in 2004 (39%). This decrease may be explained by the Post Katrina loss of multimedia classrooms and rising faculty expectations associated with their growing skills and knowledge in using technology in the classroom.

Activity 2: Faculty Professional Development

Objective 1

By 2006, 50% of the faculty will report adequate skill levels in basic technology applications and instructional equipment operation, including word processing, spreadsheets, electronic communications, electronic presentation methodologies, and other applications relevant to educational technology.

Results

Approximately 72-89% of the faculty report adequate skill levels in word processing, presentation methodologies, spreadsheets, and instructional equipment operation (Items 84, 88, 86, and 104, respectively).

Objective 2

In each project year, present emerging instructional technologies on an ongoing basis throughout the project year to all faculty.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule. According to LEC records, at least 2,669 faculty, staff and graduate students have been trained in face-to-face workshops (specific breakdowns in Appendix B, pages 50-51). Online training is also available on a continuous basis through LEC's website (links also appear in Appendix B, pages 44-46).

Objective 3

By 2006, the number of fully or partially online courses will increase from 100 to 300.

Results

In 2006, 353 fully and 300 partially online courses have been approved for a total of 653 courses, a figure that is more than double the goal. Approximately 150 fully online and 300 partially online courses are delivered per semester.

Objective 4

Between 2003 and 2006, the number of online degree programs offered by the University of Southern Mississippi will increase to 6.

Results

As of 2006, Southern Miss has 7 online degree programs with an 8th program scheduled:

1. Master of Library & Information Science in the College of Education and Psychology (CoEP)
2. Master of Music Education in the College of Arts and Letters (CoAL)
3. Master of Child & Family Development in CoEP
4. Master of Coaching Administration in the College of Health in the CoH
5. Master of Sport Administration in the CoH
6. Master of Arts of Teaching Languages in the CoAL
7. Bachelor of Science of Construction Technology in the College of Science and Technology (CoST)
8. Registered Nurse to Bachelor of Science in Nursing under development, scheduled to begin in Fall 2007-08 in the CoH

Objective 5

By 2003, 50% of USM faculty will report using email, email lists and/or ListServ to enhance teaching and learning activities.

***Special Note**: Objectives 5-7 were not measured either directly or completely through the Surveys. In most cases, faculty were questioned whether they would like to use these resources, not whether they actually did use them.

Results

Approximately 79% of the faculty reported in 2004 that they would very much like to use email/email lists with their classes. The majority (61%) also reported that existing training support met their requirements to accomplish that goal. By 2006, 83.5% of the faculty reported the desire to use class email/email lists, with almost the same majority (59%) indicating their awareness of available training support. However, in 2006, 43.3% of the faculty reported actually using ListServs with their classes. In 2004, 60.6% of the faculty reported using a ListServ. That percentage likely decreased based on the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

Objective 6

By 2004, 45% of USM faculty will report using web pages for instructional purposes.

Results

In 2004, 80% of the faculty reported that they would like to use web pages for instructional purposes and 45% knew that training was available to support that objective. By 2006, the percentage of the faculty who stated that they would like to use web pages for instructional purposes was unchanged, however 50% knew that training was available to support that objective. Only 35% of the faculty were using WebCT in 2004, while 40% of the faculty stated that they used the WebCT in 2006, which indicates that they are using web pages for instruction.

Objective 7

By 2006, 50% of USM faculty will report using multimedia presentation methods, including audio and/or video clips, slide production, and/or animation to augment curricula.

Results

In 2004, an overwhelming majority of faculty (86.8%) expressed the desire to use audio/video clips, animation, or slides to augment curricula, while 45.2% of them believed that existing training in these areas met their requirements. Around 80% of the faculty wanted to use multimedia presentations and almost 41% were aware of training support. Almost 30% of the faculty were using Quick Time Movies in class in 2004. By 2006, these numbers were virtually unchanged except that the percentage of faculty who reporting using Quick Time Movies had decreased to 18.8. In 2006, 74.4% of the faculty reported using PowerPoint, which is a type of "slide production." Adrian Castillo and Susan Rayborn advised faculty on 21 multimedia projects in 2006. Twenty-one multimedia workshops were delivered in 2006 compared to 18 in 2005. Thirteen faculty requested assistance with integration of multimedia in existing courses in 2006.

Objective 8

By 2006, there will be 4 faculty members from each college (with the exception of the Honors College and the College of Continuing, International and Distance Education) who are able to serve as mentors and providing training and guidance to their colleagues related to educational technology.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule as shown in the list below (newest mentors listed first):

Mentors from the College of Business (CoB):

1. Dr. Kuo Lane Chen, Accountancy and Information Systems
2. Dr. Melody Lo, Economics, Finance and International Business
3. Dr. Chang-Tseh Hsieh, Accountancy and Information Systems
4. Dr. Michael Vest-Management and Marketing

Mentors from the CoH:

1. Dr. Janie Butts, Nursing

2. Dr. Lee Terrio, Speech and Hearing
3. Dr. Elaine Molaison, Nutrition and Food Systems
4. Dr. Nancy Speed, Human Performance and Recreation
5. Dr. Sabrina Bryant, Medical Technology
6. Dr. Trenton E. Gould, Human Performance and Recreation
7. Dr. Ben Velasquez, Human Performance and Recreation
8. Dr. Mary Lux, Medical Technology
9. Dr. Pat Sims, Marriage and Family Therapy

Mentors from the CoEP:

1. Dr. Elizabeth Haynes, Library and Information Sciences
2. Dr. Hollie Filce and Dr. Elgen Hillman, Curric., Inst., and Sp. Ed.
3. Ms. Kim Walker, Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
4. Dr. Karen Juneau, Technology Education
5. Dr. Mary Nell McNeese, Educational Leadership and Research
6. Dr. Shuyan Wang, Technology Education
7. Dr. Steve Yuen, Technology Education
8. Dr. M.J. Norton, Library and Information Sciences
9. Dr. Taralynn Hartsell, Technology Education
10. Dr. Thelma Roberson, Educational Leadership and Research

Mentors from the CoAL:

1. Dr. Michael Salda, English
2. Dr. Bruce Tychinski, Music
3. Dr. Fei Xue, Mass Communication and Journalism
4. Dr. William Powell, Foreign Languages/Literatures
5. Dr. Marie Danforth, Anthropology and Sociology
6. Ms. Shellie Nielsen, Theatre and Dance
7. Cpt. Leigh Ann Fletcher, Aerospace Studies
8. Dr. Brigitte Burgess, Interior Design
9. Dr. Linda Dysart Goff: Speech Communication
10. Dr. Leah Fonder-Solano and Christopher Miles, Foreign Languages/Literatures
11. Dr. Lawrence A. Hosman, Speech Communication
12. Dr. Jae-Hwa Shin, Mass Communication and Journalism
13. Dr. William Kuskin and Dr. Phyllis Jestice: English and History, respectively
14. Dr. Cindy Brown, Mass Communication and Journalism
15. Dr. Steve Moser, Music
16. Dr. David Davies, Mass Communication and Journalism
17. Dr. Anita Davis, Music
18. Dr. Joan Traylor, Interior Design
19. Dr. Elizabeth Drummond, History
20. Dr. David Butler, Political Science

Mentors from the CoST:

1. Dr. Sherry Herron, Center for Science and Mathematics Education
2. Dr. Joseph Kolibal, Mathematics
3. Dr. Jeffrey Evans, Chemistry and Biochemistry
4. Dr. R. D. Ellender, Biological Sciences
5. Dr. Kenneth Curry, Biological Sciences
6. Dr. Gary Anderson, Biological Sciences

Specific Faculty Needs/Concerns Compared with Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates

Table 9: Ranked List of Barriers to Using the Technology Applications and Media that Faculty Would Like to Use Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates

Barrier	Available Resources	Resource Utilization Rates
Unawareness of incentive programs (e.g. leave time, contribution toward tenure, or financial rewards)-70%	**While the PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants are no available, the Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the US Department of Education (USDOE) are available. Contact the Sponsored Programs Administration (SPA) for assistance.**	**At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received incentives from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received Title III-A mini grant incentives. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards continue to offer incentives. Faculty currently have and continue to seek grant funding that offers leave time, contribution toward tenure and financial rewards for using technology.**
Lack of departmental funds to pay for software costs-68%	**The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**	**At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received hardware/software from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received hardware/software from Title III-A mini grants. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards continue to fund for software.**
Unavailability of technology in their classrooms-56%	**Title III-A equipped 40 multimedia classrooms. Classroom technology, either mounted or mobile is available for loan and listed in Appendix B by campus location on pages 64-68. While PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants are no longer available, the Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Contact SPA for funding assistance.**	**The resources utilization rates are listed in Appendix B by campus location on pages 80-83.**

Table 9: Ranked List of Barriers to Using the Technology Applications and Media that Faculty Would Like to Use Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates (continued)

Barrier	Available Resources	Resource Utilization
Out-of-date hardware-51.2%	**During the period the survey covered, PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants were available. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**	**During the period the survey covered, many faculty received PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards have been and are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE has been and continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**
Lack of on-site (e.g. classroom or lab) support-50%	**HELPDesk, LEC, and Title III-A Faculty Technology Mentors in all 5 colleges could offer on-site support on an appointment basis. Specific listing of LEC services is listed on pages 71-75.**	**The resources utilization rates for the HELPDesk, LEC, and DEAL are listed in Appendix B by campus location on pages 80-83.**
Lack of skill/knowledge needed to use their desired technology-41.7%	**LEC, iTech and Title III-A Faculty Technology Mentors in all 5 colleges could or do offer tutorial support online and on an appointment basis. Specific links to LEC's online tutorials and other services is listed on pages 71-75.**	**Enrollment/Attendance for Expanding Excellence, WebCT, and HVUCs are listed on page 83.**
Cost of software applications was too high-37.8%	**During the period the survey covered, PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants were available. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**	**At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received hardware/software from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received hardware/software from Title III-A mini grants. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards, established in 1991, continue to offer funds for software. Faculty currently have and continue to seek grant funding for software.**

Table 9: Ranked List of Barriers to Using the Technology Applications and Media that Faculty Would Like to Use Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates (continued)

Barrier	Available Resources	Resource Utilization
Lack of time to use the desired technology-32%	During the period the survey covered, PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants purchased some faculty release time. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards and Summer Research Grants still offer this incentive. Funding through grantors such as the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the US Department of Education (USDOE) continues to be available. Contact the Sponsored Programs Administration (SPA) for assistance.	At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received incentives from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received Title III-A mini grant incentives. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards, established in 1991, continue to offer faculty travel opportunities to keep current on technology. Faculty currently have and continue to seek grant funding that offers leave time.
Just too much trouble-30.3%	LEC, iTech, and Title III-A Faculty Technology Mentors can offer effective and efficient ways to integrate technology into instruction. LEC's instructional designers are available on an appointment basis. Expanding Excellence Workshops are available on current technology topics. Online tutorials are available for faculty who would like to learn new technology skills on their own time and pace.	The resources utilization rates for the HELPDesk, LEC, DEAL, and the HVUCs are listed in Appendix B by campus location on pages 80-83.
Desired applications and media would not run on the machines in the computing sites-24.5%	iTech equipment services offers consultation on hardware/software interface, as well as assistance ordering compatible hardware/software. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.	The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.

Table 10: Ranked List of Faculty Needs/Concerns Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates

Needs/Concerns	Available Resources	Resource Utilization Rates
Lack of Internet Access-59.4%	iTech Campus Infrastructure/Networking have been/and continue to address these issues. See Appendix B, page 51-52.	iTech Campus Infrastructure/Networking have been/and continue to address these issues. See Appendix B, page 51-52.
Unresponsiveness of Southern Miss' iTech Support Services to	iTech HELPDesk and Equipment Services offer	See Appendix B on page 53.

meet their needs-55.2%	**customer services.**	
Lack of Network Access-54.9%	**iTech Campus Infrastructure/Networking have been/and continue to address these issues. See Appendix B, page 79-80.**	**iTech Campus Infrastructure/Networking have been/and continue to address these issues. See Appendix B, page 79-80.**
Lack of instructors' computer stations-50%	**iTech Equipment Services offers loaner equipment. A list of equipment available through Cox Library is in Appendix B, page 64. Equipment available through Equipment Services on the Hattiesburg campus is in Appendix B, page 65.**	**The use of this type of equipment has not been tracked.**
Unable to reserve a multimedia classroom-45.9%	**Deans' offices inform the Registrar's Office when faculty are trained by LEC to use the HVUCs. After you complete this training, check with your Dean's office for assistance.**	**The HVUCs utilization rates are in Appendix B, page 83.**
Unfamiliarity with iTech campus resources-43.9%	**HELPDesk, LEC, DEAL, and Title III-A Faculty Technology Mentors are available to familiarize faculty with iTech campus resources.**	**The HELPDesk, LEC, and DEAL utilization rates are in Appendix B, pages 53-55.**
Lack of Computer Projection Capabilities-41%	**During the period the survey covered, PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants were available. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**	**At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received hardware/software from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received hardware/software from Title III-A mini grants. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards, established in 1991, continue to offer funds for software. Faculty currently have and continue to seek grant funding for software.**

Table 10: Ranked List of Faculty Needs/Concerns Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates (Continued)

Needs/Concerns	Available Resources	Resource Utilization Rates
Lack of Electronic Pointers-38.8%	**During the period the survey covered, PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants were available. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**	**At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received resources from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received resources from Title III-A mini grants. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards, established in 1991, continue to offer funds. Faculty currently have and continue to seek grant funding for resources.**
Lack of Lapel Microphones-38%	**During the period the survey covered, PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants were available. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**	**At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received resources from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received resources from Title III-A mini grants. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards, established in 1991, continue to offer funds. Faculty currently have and continue to seek grant funding for resources.**
Lack of Audio and Video Capabilities-32.6%	**During the period the survey covered, PT^3 and Title III-A mini grants were available. The Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards are still available annually. Funding through grantors such as the NSF and the USDOE continues to be available. Contact SPA for assistance.**	**At least 11 faculty teams and 25 faculty members received hardware/software from the PT^3 grant. Approximately 50 faculty received hardware/software from Title III-A mini grants. The Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards, established in 1991, continue to offer funds for software. Faculty currently have and continue to seek grant funding for software.**

Specific Support/Training Issues

Table 11: Ranked List of Technology Functions Faculty Would Like to Use if Supported Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates

Functions	Available Resources	Resource Utilization Rates
Multimedia presentations-84.2%	**LEC resources are listed in Appendix B, pages 71-75. Contact LEC at: http://www.usm.edu/lec**	**The LEC utilization rates are in Appendix B, page 83 .**
Audio and video clips, animation, or slides-83.8%	**LEC resources are listed in Appendix B, pages 71-75. Contact LEC at : http://www.usm.edu/lec**	**The LEC utilization rates are in Appendix B, page 83.**

Table 11: Ranked List of Technology Functions Faculty Would Like to Use if Supported Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates (Continued)

Class Email list-83.5%	**LEC and DEAL resources are listed in Appendix B, pages 69-75. Contact LEC at: http://www.usm.edu/lec and DEAL at: http://www.usm.edu/deal**	**The LEC and DEAL utilization rates are in Appendix B, pages 83.**
Functions	**Available Resources**	**Resource Utilization Rates**
Using the Web to conduct research-82.4%	**Cox and Cook Library Information Specialists [http://www.lib.usm.edu]**	**The total number of contacts with Library Information Specialists has not been tracked.**
Using a Web page with course materials-79.5%	**LEC and DEAL are listed in Appendix B, pages 69-75. Contact LEC at: http://www.usm.edu/lec and DEAL at: http://www.usm.edu/deal**	**The LEC and DEAL utilization rates are in Appendix B, pages 83**
Using the Web for online materials archives-72.1%	**LEC and DEAL resources are listed in Appendix B, pages 69-75. Contact LEC at :http://www.usm.edu/lec and DEAL at: http://www.usm.edu/deal**	**The LEC and DEAL utilization rates are in Appendix B, pages 83**
Using the Web to facilitate collaboration with people at Southern Miss-67.3%	**LEC resources are listed in Appendix B, pages 71-75 Contact the HELPDesk at the Gulf Coast Campuses at: http://www.usm.edu/gulfcoast/ and at the Hattiesburg Campus at http://www.usm.edu/itech/help/index.html**	**The HELPDesk and LEC utilization rates are in Appendix B, pages 80 and 83.**
Using the Web to gather information via online quizzes, etc.-66.6%	**LEC and DEAL are listed in Appendix B, pages 69-75. Contact LEC at: http://www.usm.edu/lec and DEAL at: http://www.usm.edu/deal**	**The LEC and DEAL utilization rates are in Appendix B, pages 83.**
Using the Web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world-61.4%	**LEC resources are listed in Appendix B, pages 71-75. Contact LEC at : http://www.usm.edu/lec**	**The LEC utilization rates are in Appendix B, page 83.**
Using a class electronic bulletin board/forum on the Web-59.5%	**LEC and DEAL are listed in Appendix B, pages 69-75. Contact LEC at : http://www.usm.edu/lec and DEAL at: http://www.usm.edu/deal**	**The LEC and DEAL utilization rates are in Appendix B, pages 83.**

Overall Recommendations

- **LEC:** LEC should seek innovative ways of evaluating what hardware and software training faculty need. One possibility would be to survey or conduct a focus group with the Title III-A faculty mentors regarding the needs in their departments/schools/colleges. LEC should encourage Title III-A Faculty Technology Mentors to provide on-site training and support to their fellow faculty, whenever possible. These mentors should model the exploration of new hardware and software beyond the MS Office Suite applications, to which most faculty are limited. The Technology Teas, trade exhibits for instructional technology equipment and software sponsored by commercial vendors, should be continued and expanded to accomplish this. LEC should make special note of the following when planning training: Table 9: Ranked List of Barriers to Using the Technology Applications and Media that Faculty Would Like to Use Compared to

Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates, Table 10: Ranked List of Faculty Needs/Concerns Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates, and Table 11: Ranked List of Technology Functions Faculty Would Like to Use if Supported Compared to Available Resources and Resource Utilization Rates. The Technology Brown Bag Series should be expanded, utilizing more of the Technology Mentors. Finally, LEC could set up focus groups with faculty who do not see the value of using technology in their teaching.

- **iTech:** iTech should persist in resolving internet and network access issues and establish a systematic plan to renew hardware. Secondly, iTech should continue to market the availability of existing campus resources and support services to the faculty, particularly new faculty members during their orientation period. iTech's electronic newsletters [http://www.usm.edu/itech/news/index.html] are a proven method of accomplishing this. Furthermore, iTech should continue to focus on customer service issues by seeking avenues of dialogue with faculty who may not have participated in the Technology Survey(s). iTech should especially focus on unresolved support issues, such as student lab access to software such as SPSS statistical software, which is used in teaching statistics to students from all 5 colleges. iTech may need to initiate the involvement of the University Administration to resolve some of these issues. Finally, while the University has conducted 3 faculty technology surveys, there have been no surveys of the staff and student perceptions of technology. It is recommended that iTech consider administering such surveys.
- **DEAL:** DEAL should maintain its focus on customer support for Web-related instruction, particularly as WebCT software upgrades to version 6.0 are being implemented during the spring semester of 2007. DEAL should market the new capabilities of WebCT, version 6 such as electronic portfolios, which are recommended for use by both NCATE and SACS.
- **COX and COOK LIBRARIES:** The libraries should consider expanding their "Lunch and a Workshop" series to provide workshops for faculty who wish to conduct research on the Web. It is also recommended that the Libraries continue to offer to departmental research workshops for faculty, graduate teaching and research assistants. Workshop requests are accessible online at: http://www.lib.usm.edu/instruction/BIrequest.php .

APPENDIX A

Frequencies and Percentages for the 2006 Sample

1. There are no barriers to my using the applications and media I would like to use.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	21	16.5	17.1	17.1
	Somewhat Disagree	50	39.4	40.7	57.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	15	11.8	12.2	69.9
	Somewhat Agree	24	18.9	19.5	89.4
	Strongly Agree	13	10.2	10.6	100.0
	Total	123	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	3.1		
Total		127	100.0		

2. I do not have the time.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	27	21.3	22.7	22.7
	Somewhat Disagree	24	18.9	20.2	42.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	18	14.2	15.1	58.0
	Somewhat Agree	34	26.8	28.6	86.6
	Strongly Agree	16	12.6	13.4	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

3. I have not acquired the necessary skills.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	32	25.2	26.7	26.7
	Somewhat Disagree	20	15.7	16.7	43.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	18	14.2	15.0	58.3
	Somewhat Agree	41	32.3	34.2	92.5
	Strongly Agree	9	7.1	7.5	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

4. I do not have technical support on campus.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	24	18.9	20.3	20.3
	Somewhat Disagree	31	24.4	26.3	46.6
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	28	22.0	23.7	70.3
	Somewhat Agree	22	17.3	18.6	89.0
	Strongly Agree	13	10.2	11.0	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

5. I do not have on-site (e.g., classroom, lab) support.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	17	13.4	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Disagree	20	15.7	16.8	31.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	23	18.1	19.3	50.4
	Somewhat Agree	37	29.1	31.1	81.5
	Strongly Agree	22	17.3	18.5	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

6. I do not know how to incorporate technology into my classes.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	52	40.9	43.7	43.7
	Somewhat Disagree	33	26.0	27.7	71.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	17	13.4	14.3	85.7
	Somewhat Agree	14	11.0	11.8	97.5
	Strongly Agree	3	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

7. It is too expensive.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	37	29.1	31.1	31.1
	Somewhat Disagree	22	17.3	18.5	49.6
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	31	24.4	26.1	75.6
	Somewhat Agree	24	18.9	20.2	95.8
	Strongly Agree	5	3.9	4.2	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

8. I do not know how to get access.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	42	33.1	35.3	35.3
	Somewhat Disagree	43	33.9	36.1	71.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	19	15.0	16.0	87.4
	Somewhat Agree	13	10.2	10.9	98.3
	Strongly Agree	2	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

9. I need upgraded hardware.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	11.8	12.6	12.6
	Somewhat Disagree	18	14.2	15.1	27.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	25	19.7	21.0	48.7
	Somewhat Agree	38	29.9	31.9	80.7
	Strongly Agree	23	18.1	19.3	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

10. The technology is not available in my classroom.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	9.2	9.2
	Somewhat Disagree	22	17.3	18.3	27.5
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	20	15.7	16.7	44.2
	Somewhat Agree	35	27.6	29.2	73.3
	Strongly Agree	32	25.2	26.7	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

11. The applications and media do not run on machines in the computing sites.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	22	17.3	18.6	18.6
	Somewhat Disagree	37	29.1	31.4	50.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	30	23.6	25.4	75.4
	Somewhat Agree	20	15.7	16.9	92.4
	Strongly Agree	9	7.1	7.6	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

12. I am not sure how to legally use copyrighted materials.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	43	33.9	35.8	35.8
	Somewhat Disagree	34	26.8	28.3	64.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	21	16.5	17.5	81.7
	Somewhat Agree	17	13.4	14.2	95.8
	Strongly Agree	5	3.9	4.2	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

13. It is too much trouble.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	31	24.4	26.1	26.1
	Somewhat Disagree	26	20.5	21.8	47.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	26	20.5	21.8	69.7
	Somewhat Agree	29	22.8	24.4	94.1
	Strongly Agree	7	5.5	5.9	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

14. I do not have departmental funds to pay software costs.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	9.1	9.1
	Somewhat Disagree	5	3.9	4.1	13.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	22	17.3	18.2	31.4
	Somewhat Agree	44	34.6	36.4	67.8
	Strongly Agree	39	30.7	32.2	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

15. There is no incentive program (e.g., leave time, contribution towards tenure, financial rewards).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	9.2	9.2
	Somewhat Disagree	3	2.4	2.5	11.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	22	17.3	18.3	30.0
	Somewhat Agree	30	23.6	25.0	55.0
	Strongly Agree	54	42.5	45.0	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

16. The cost of the software applications that I use for instruction is high.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	9.4	10.1	10.1
	Somewhat Disagree	20	15.7	16.8	26.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	42	33.1	35.3	62.2
	Somewhat Agree	33	26.0	27.7	89.9
	Strongly Agree	12	9.4	10.1	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

17. I am better able to use information technology now than I was five years ago.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	.8	.8	.8
	Somewhat Disagree	8	6.3	6.3	7.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	9	7.1	7.1	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	47	37.0	37.3	51.6
	Strongly Agree	61	48.0	48.4	100.0
	Total	126	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.8		
Total		127	100.0		

18. I am better able to use information technology now than I was two years ago.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Somewhat Disagree	7	5.5	5.5	7.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	22	17.3	17.3	25.2
	Somewhat Agree	52	40.9	40.9	66.1
	Strongly Agree	43	33.9	33.9	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

19. I am able to do everything I need to/want to using USM information technology resources.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	27	21.3	21.3	21.3
	Somewhat Disagree	38	29.9	29.9	51.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	30	23.6	23.6	74.8
	Somewhat Agree	24	18.9	18.9	93.7
	Strongly Agree	8	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

20. I am able to access all USM computing resources I need from my office.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	17	13.4	13.7	13.7
	Somewhat Disagree	29	22.8	23.4	37.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	28	22.0	22.6	59.7
	Somewhat Agree	37	29.1	29.8	89.5
	Strongly Agree	13	10.2	10.5	100.0
	Total	124	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.4		
Total		127	100.0		

21. I am able to access all USM computing resources I need from my home.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	25	19.7	20.5	20.5
	Somewhat Disagree	36	28.3	29.5	50.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	41	32.3	33.6	83.6
	Somewhat Agree	14	11.0	11.5	95.1
	Strongly Agree	6	4.7	4.9	100.0
	Total	122	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.9		
Total		127	100.0		

22. I have all the technological facilities I need in the classrooms I use.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	41	32.3	32.3	32.3
	Somewhat Disagree	34	26.8	26.8	59.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	19	15.0	15.0	74.0
	Somewhat Agree	26	20.5	20.5	94.5
	Strongly Agree	7	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

23. I do not need any technological facilities in the classrooms I use.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	77	60.6	62.1	62.1
	Somewhat Disagree	28	22.0	22.6	84.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	8	6.3	6.5	91.1
	Somewhat Agree	8	6.3	6.5	97.6
	Strongly Agree	3	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	124	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.4		
Total		127	100.0		

24. Internet access.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	38	29.9	30.9	30.9
	Somewhat Disagree	35	27.6	28.5	59.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	7	5.5	5.7	65.0
	Somewhat Agree	16	12.6	13.0	78.0
	Strongly Agree	27	21.3	22.0	100.0
	Total	123	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	3.1		
Total		127	100.0		

25. Network connections.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	34	26.8	27.9	27.9
	Somewhat Disagree	33	26.0	27.0	54.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	15	11.8	12.3	67.2
	Somewhat Agree	13	10.2	10.7	77.9
	Strongly Agree	27	21.3	22.1	100.0
	Total	122	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.9		
Total		127	100.0		

26. Computer projection capabilities.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	28	22.0	23.0	23.0
	Somewhat Disagree	22	17.3	18.0	41.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	10	7.9	8.2	49.2
	Somewhat Agree	32	25.2	26.2	75.4
	Strongly Agree	30	23.6	24.6	100.0
	Total	122	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.9		
Total		127	100.0		

27. A lapel microphone.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	27	21.3	23.3	23.3
	Somewhat Disagree	17	13.4	14.7	37.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	26	20.5	22.4	60.3
	Somewhat Agree	25	19.7	21.6	81.9
	Strongly Agree	21	16.5	18.1	100.0
	Total	116	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		127	100.0		

28. Electronic pointers.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	23	18.1	19.8	19.8
	Somewhat Disagree	22	17.3	19.0	38.8
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	15	11.8	12.9	51.7
	Somewhat Agree	29	22.8	25.0	76.7
	Strongly Agree	27	21.3	23.3	100.0
	Total	116	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		127	100.0		

29. Student computers.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	25	19.7	21.2	21.2
	Somewhat Disagree	13	10.2	11.0	32.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	18	14.2	15.3	47.5
	Somewhat Agree	17	13.4	14.4	61.9
	Strongly Agree	45	35.4	38.1	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

30. Instructor's computer station.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	25	19.7	20.8	20.8
	Somewhat Disagree	17	13.4	14.2	35.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	18	14.2	15.0	50.0
	Somewhat Agree	21	16.5	17.5	67.5
	Strongly Agree	39	30.7	32.5	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

45. Use a class electronic bulletin board/forum on the web.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	10	7.9	8.3	8.3
	Somewhat Disagree	16	12.6	13.3	21.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	43	33.9	35.8	57.5
	Somewhat Agree	33	26.0	27.5	85.0
	Strongly Agree	18	14.2	15.0	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

46. Use audio/video clips, animation, or slides.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	.8	.8	.8
	Somewhat Disagree	8	6.3	6.5	7.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	11	8.7	8.9	16.3
	Somewhat Agree	36	28.3	29.3	45.5
	Strongly Agree	67	52.8	54.5	100.0
	Total	123	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	3.1		
Total		127	100.0		

47. Use audio/video clips, animation, or slides.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	7.1	7.4	7.4
	Somewhat Disagree	24	18.9	19.7	27.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	39	30.7	32.0	59.0
	Somewhat Agree	33	26.0	27.0	86.1
	Strongly Agree	17	13.4	13.9	100.0
	Total	122	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.9		
Total		127	100.0		

48. Use streaming video.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1	3.3	3.3
	Somewhat Disagree	14	11.0	11.7	15.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	31	24.4	25.8	40.8
	Somewhat Agree	23	18.1	19.2	60.0
	Strongly Agree	48	37.8	40.0	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

49. Use streaming video.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	19	15.0	15.8	15.8
	Somewhat Disagree	26	20.5	21.7	37.5
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	49	38.6	40.8	78.3
	Somewhat Agree	21	16.5	17.5	95.8
	Strongly Agree	5	3.9	4.2	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

50. Use self-paced practice and tests of routine tasks.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	6.3	6.7	6.7
	Somewhat Disagree	20	15.7	16.7	23.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	32	25.2	26.7	50.0
	Somewhat Agree	26	20.5	21.7	71.7
	Strongly Agree	34	26.8	28.3	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

51. Use self-paced practice and tests of routine tasks.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	13	10.2	11.0	11.0
	Somewhat Disagree	13	10.2	11.0	22.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	56	44.1	47.5	69.5
	Somewhat Agree	25	19.7	21.2	90.7
	Strongly Agree	11	8.7	9.3	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

52. Use computer simulations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	9.2	9.2
	Somewhat Disagree	16	12.6	13.4	22.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	33	26.0	27.7	50.4
	Somewhat Agree	27	21.3	22.7	73.1
	Strongly Agree	32	25.2	26.9	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

53. Use computer simulations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	16	12.6	13.6	13.6
	Somewhat Disagree	21	16.5	17.8	31.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	58	45.7	49.2	80.5
	Somewhat Agree	16	12.6	13.6	94.1
	Strongly Agree	7	5.5	5.9	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

54. Use self-paced tutorials with audio/video clips.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	7.1	7.6	7.6
	Somewhat Disagree	14	11.0	11.9	19.5
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	32	25.2	27.1	46.6
	Somewhat Agree	31	24.4	26.3	72.9
	Strongly Agree	32	25.2	27.1	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

55. Use self-paced tutorials with audio/video clips.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	11.8	12.7	12.7
	Somewhat Disagree	18	14.2	15.3	28.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	59	46.5	50.0	78.0
	Somewhat Agree	19	15.0	16.1	94.1
	Strongly Agree	7	5.5	5.9	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

56. Use multimedia presentations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.6	1.7	1.7
	Somewhat Disagree	6	4.7	5.0	6.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	11	8.7	9.2	15.8
	Somewhat Agree	42	33.1	35.0	50.8
	Strongly Agree	59	46.5	49.2	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

57. Use multimedia presentations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	6.3	6.6	6.6
	Somewhat Disagree	26	20.5	21.3	27.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	31	24.4	25.4	53.3
	Somewhat Agree	43	33.9	35.2	88.5
	Strongly Agree	14	11.0	11.5	100.0
	Total	122	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.9		
Total		127	100.0		

58. Use the web to conduct research.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	2.4	2.5	2.5
	Somewhat Disagree	5	3.9	4.2	6.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	13	10.2	10.9	17.6
	Somewhat Agree	29	22.8	24.4	42.0
	Strongly Agree	69	54.3	58.0	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

59. Use the web to conduct research.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	7.1	7.4	7.4
	Somewhat Disagree	6	4.7	5.0	12.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	34	26.8	28.1	40.5
	Somewhat Agree	32	25.2	26.4	66.9
	Strongly Agree	40	31.5	33.1	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

60. Use the web to present work to other people at USM.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	6.3	6.7	6.7
	Somewhat Disagree	13	10.2	10.9	17.6
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	34	26.8	28.6	46.2
	Somewhat Agree	21	16.5	17.6	63.9
	Strongly Agree	43	33.9	36.1	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

61. Use the web to present work to other people at USM.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	6.3	6.8	6.8
	Somewhat Disagree	16	12.6	13.6	20.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	50	39.4	42.4	62.7
	Somewhat Agree	24	18.9	20.3	83.1
	Strongly Agree	20	15.7	16.9	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

62. Use the web to present work to people around the world.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	5.5	5.8	5.8
	Somewhat Disagree	13	10.2	10.8	16.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	30	23.6	25.0	41.7
	Somewhat Agree	27	21.3	22.5	64.2
	Strongly Agree	43	33.9	35.8	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

63. Use the web to present work to people around the world.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	9.3	9.3
	Somewhat Disagree	14	11.0	11.9	21.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	53	41.7	44.9	66.1
	Somewhat Agree	25	19.7	21.2	87.3
	Strongly Agree	15	11.8	12.7	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

64. Use the web to conduct simulations or visualizations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	13	10.2	11.0	11.0
	Somewhat Disagree	15	11.8	12.7	23.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	35	27.6	29.7	53.4
	Somewhat Agree	23	18.1	19.5	72.9
	Strongly Agree	32	25.2	27.1	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

65. Use the web to conduct simulations or visualizations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	14	11.0	11.9	11.9
	Somewhat Disagree	26	20.5	22.0	33.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	55	43.3	46.6	80.5
	Somewhat Agree	12	9.4	10.2	90.7
	Strongly Agree	11	8.7	9.3	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

66. Use the web to facilitate collaboration with people at USM.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	4.7	5.0	5.0
	Somewhat Disagree	8	6.3	6.7	11.8
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	25	19.7	21.0	32.8
	Somewhat Agree	44	34.6	37.0	69.7
	Strongly Agree	36	28.3	30.3	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

67. Use the web to facilitate collaboration with people at USM.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	7.1	7.6	7.6
	Somewhat Disagree	14	11.0	11.9	19.5
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	51	40.2	43.2	62.7
	Somewhat Agree	24	18.9	20.3	83.1
	Strongly Agree	20	15.7	16.9	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

68. Use the web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	5.5	5.9	5.9
	Somewhat Disagree	7	5.5	5.9	11.8
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	32	25.2	26.9	38.7
	Somewhat Agree	36	28.3	30.3	68.9
	Strongly Agree	37	29.1	31.1	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

69. Use the web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	9.3	9.3
	Somewhat Disagree	20	15.7	16.9	26.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	49	38.6	41.5	67.8
	Somewhat Agree	25	19.7	21.2	89.0
	Strongly Agree	13	10.2	11.0	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

70. Use the web to gather information via on-line quizzes, etc.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	5.5	6.0	6.0
	Somewhat Disagree	13	10.2	11.1	17.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	19	15.0	16.2	33.3
	Somewhat Agree	37	29.1	31.6	65.0
	Strongly Agree	41	32.3	35.0	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

71. Use the web to gather information via on-line quizzes, etc.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	14	11.0	12.0	12.0
	Somewhat Disagree	13	10.2	11.1	23.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	47	37.0	40.2	63.2
	Somewhat Agree	27	21.3	23.1	86.3
	Strongly Agree	16	12.6	13.7	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

72. Use the web for on-line materials archives.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.6	1.7	1.7
	Somewhat Disagree	8	6.3	6.8	8.5
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	23	18.1	19.5	28.0
	Somewhat Agree	37	29.1	31.4	59.3
	Strongly Agree	48	37.8	40.7	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

73. Use the web for on-line materials archives.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	7.1	7.5	7.5
	Somewhat Disagree	18	14.2	15.0	22.5
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	47	37.0	39.2	61.7
	Somewhat Agree	29	22.8	24.2	85.8
	Strongly Agree	17	13.4	14.2	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

74. Use the web for on-line course reserves.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1	3.4	3.4
	Somewhat Disagree	9	7.1	7.7	11.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	29	22.8	24.8	35.9
	Somewhat Agree	31	24.4	26.5	62.4
	Strongly Agree	44	34.6	37.6	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

75. Use the web for on-line course reserves.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	9.4	9.4
	Somewhat Disagree	10	7.9	8.5	17.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	46	36.2	39.3	57.3
	Somewhat Agree	31	24.4	26.5	83.8
	Strongly Agree	19	15.0	16.2	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

76. Use the web for course delivery.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	13	10.2	11.0	11.0
	Somewhat Disagree	12	9.4	10.2	21.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	26	20.5	22.0	43.2
	Somewhat Agree	26	20.5	22.0	65.3
	Strongly Agree	41	32.3	34.7	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

85. Microsoft Word.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.6	1.7	1.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	7	5.5	5.8	7.4
	Somewhat Agree	24	18.9	19.8	27.3
	Strongly Agree	88	69.3	72.7	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

86. Microsoft Excel

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	4.7	5.0	5.0
	Somewhat Disagree	7	5.5	5.9	10.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	21	16.5	17.6	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	46	36.2	38.7	67.2
	Strongly Agree	39	30.7	32.8	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

87. Microsoft Excel

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	5.5	5.9	5.9
	Somewhat Disagree	11	8.7	9.2	15.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	14	11.0	11.8	26.9
	Somewhat Agree	38	29.9	31.9	58.8
	Strongly Agree	49	38.6	41.2	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

88. Power Point

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1	3.3	3.3
	Somewhat Disagree	5	3.9	4.1	7.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	13	10.2	10.7	18.2
	Somewhat Agree	43	33.9	35.5	53.7
	Strongly Agree	56	44.1	46.3	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

89. Power Point

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	4.7	5.0	5.0
	Somewhat Disagree	10	7.9	8.3	13.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	15	11.8	12.4	25.6
	Somewhat Agree	29	22.8	24.0	49.6
	Strongly Agree	61	48.0	50.4	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

90. Microsoft Access

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	41	32.3	35.0	35.0
	Somewhat Disagree	22	17.3	18.8	53.8
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	28	22.0	23.9	77.8
	Somewhat Agree	12	9.4	10.3	88.0
	Strongly Agree	14	11.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

91. Microsoft Access

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	48	37.8	41.0	41.0
	Somewhat Disagree	23	18.1	19.7	60.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	24	18.9	20.5	81.2
	Somewhat Agree	7	5.5	6.0	87.2
	Strongly Agree	15	11.8	12.8	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

92. Adobe Photoshop

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	33	26.0	27.7	27.7
	Somewhat Disagree	31	24.4	26.1	53.8
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	21	16.5	17.6	71.4
	Somewhat Agree	21	16.5	17.6	89.1
	Strongly Agree	13	10.2	10.9	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

93. Adobe Photoshop

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	40	31.5	33.6	33.6
	Somewhat Disagree	27	21.3	22.7	56.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	26	20.5	21.8	78.2
	Somewhat Agree	15	11.8	12.6	90.8
	Strongly Agree	11	8.7	9.2	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

94. Adobe Distiller (for creating PDF documents)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	40	31.5	33.9	33.9
	Somewhat Disagree	24	18.9	20.3	54.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	22	17.3	18.6	72.9
	Somewhat Agree	17	13.4	14.4	87.3
	Strongly Agree	15	11.8	12.7	100.0
	Total	118	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	7.1		
Total		127	100.0		

95. Adobe Distiller (for creating PDF documents)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	40	31.5	34.2	34.2
	Somewhat Disagree	25	19.7	21.4	55.6
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	21	16.5	17.9	73.5
	Somewhat Agree	11	8.7	9.4	82.9
	Strongly Agree	20	15.7	17.1	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

96. Adobe Page Maker

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	56	44.1	47.9	47.9
	Somewhat Disagree	28	22.0	23.9	71.8
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	17	13.4	14.5	86.3
	Somewhat Agree	7	5.5	6.0	92.3
	Strongly Agree	9	7.1	7.7	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

97. Adobe Page Maker

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	59	46.5	50.4	50.4
	Somewhat Disagree	21	16.5	17.9	68.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	21	16.5	17.9	86.3
	Somewhat Agree	6	4.7	5.1	91.5
	Strongly Agree	10	7.9	8.5	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

98. Adobe Illustrator

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	57	44.9	48.7	48.7
	Somewhat Disagree	25	19.7	21.4	70.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	25	19.7	21.4	91.5
	Somewhat Agree	4	3.1	3.4	94.9
	Strongly Agree	6	4.7	5.1	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

99. Adobe Illustrator

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	59	46.5	50.4	50.4
	Somewhat Disagree	22	17.3	18.8	69.2
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	23	18.1	19.7	88.9
	Somewhat Agree	6	4.7	5.1	94.0
	Strongly Agree	7	5.5	6.0	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

100. Quick Time Movies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	51	40.2	43.6	43.6
	Somewhat Disagree	15	11.8	12.8	56.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	26	20.5	22.2	78.6
	Somewhat Agree	13	10.2	11.1	89.7
	Strongly Agree	12	9.4	10.3	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

101. Quick Time Movies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	47	37.0	40.2	40.2
	Somewhat Disagree	20	15.7	17.1	57.3
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	28	22.0	23.9	81.2
	Somewhat Agree	12	9.4	10.3	91.5
	Strongly Agree	10	7.9	8.5	100.0
	Total	117	92.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.9		
Total		127	100.0		

102. Equipments in Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	24	18.9	20.9	20.9
	Somewhat Disagree	14	11.0	12.2	33.0
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	25	19.7	21.7	54.8
	Somewhat Agree	24	18.9	20.9	75.7
	Strongly Agree	28	22.0	24.3	100.0
	Total	115	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.4		
Total		127	100.0		

103. Equipments in Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	30	23.6	26.1	26.1
	Somewhat Disagree	15	11.8	13.0	39.1
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	19	15.0	16.5	55.7
	Somewhat Agree	22	17.3	19.1	74.8
	Strongly Agree	29	22.8	25.2	100.0
	Total	115	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.4		
Total		127	100.0		

104. Using a data projector with laptop/computer/television

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	6.3	6.6	6.6
	Somewhat Disagree	11	8.7	9.1	15.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	13	10.2	10.7	26.4
	Somewhat Agree	45	35.4	37.2	63.6
	Strongly Agree	44	34.6	36.4	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

105. Using a data projector with laptop/computer/television

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	9.4	9.9	9.9
	Somewhat Disagree	9	7.1	7.4	17.4
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	15	11.8	12.4	29.8
	Somewhat Agree	36	28.3	29.8	59.5
	Strongly Agree	49	38.6	40.5	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

106. Using SPSS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	35	27.6	29.2	29.2
	Somewhat Disagree	15	11.8	12.5	41.7
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	21	16.5	17.5	59.2
	Somewhat Agree	29	22.8	24.2	83.3
	Strongly Agree	20	15.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	120	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.5		
Total		127	100.0		

107. Using SPSS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	35	27.6	29.4	29.4
	Somewhat Disagree	16	12.6	13.4	42.9
	Neither Agree nor DIsagree	19	15.0	16.0	58.8
	Somewhat Agree	28	22.0	23.5	82.4
	Strongly Agree	21	16.5	17.6	100.0
	Total	119	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.3		
Total		127	100.0		

108. Did you take this survey in August 2001 when it was first administered?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	39	30.7	33.9	33.9
	No	76	59.8	66.1	100.0
	Total	115	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.4		
Total		127	100.0		

109.Did you take this survey in January 2004 the second time it was administered?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	47	37.0	40.9	40.9
	No	68	53.5	59.1	100.0
	Total	115	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.4		
Total		127	100.0		

110. Employed since January 2004, or have you been promoted from a staff of student position to a faculty position since January 2004?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	68	53.5	55.7	55.7
	No	54	42.5	44.3	100.0
	Total	122	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.9		
Total		127	100.0		

111. Professional Education Faculty (PEF)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	34	26.8	28.1	28.1
	No	87	68.5	71.9	100.0
	Total	121	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.7		
Total		127	100.0		

Appendix B

Technology Resources Available at Southern Miss and their Utilization Rate

Technology Resources Available at Coastal Campuses

Listed below are the classrooms on the GCSSC and Jackson County campuses that have installed LCD projectors:

GCSSC:
Rooms 110, 111, 112, 116, 117, 118, 123, 125, 130, 131B, 131D, 131F, 131G, 133, 134A – (IVN room), 134C, 134D, 134H, 135, 138A, 138B, 138L, 138M, 141H, Eagle Village 101, Eagle Village 102, Eagle Village 103, and Eagle Village 104

Jackson County:
Rooms 111, 112, 113A, 113B, 114, 115, 214 – (IVN room), and 218 – (IVN room)

Any other "loaner equipment" is handled by the **Cox Library**, which offers the following specific technology resources/services:

- Access to electronic resources
- Free printing of journal articles through July 30, 2006
- Laptop checkouts (at no charge)
- Reference and research services through desktop computers
- AV equipment
    - 17 TVs
    - 5 VCRs
    - 17 TV/VCR Combos
    - 17 DVD/VCR Combos
    - 4 DVD Players
    - 10 Overhead Projectors
    - 2 Video Data Projectors
    - 16 Carts
    - 4 Easels
    - 2 Screens
- In-classroom library instruction
- Computer classes on Microsoft Office programs and SPSS on request

Technology Resources Available at Hattiesburg Campus

Loaner equipment currently available in Equipment Services:

19 Dell laptops have been replaced with 25 IBM ThinkPad R51 notebooks.
6 Dell desktop computers have been taken out of the loaner pool and were not replaced.
1 portable SMARTBoard in the loaner pool and another one in second floor HPR conference room
9 data/video projectors, VCR, speaker and small cart
3 data/video projectors with cases
2 iBook Mac laptop computers
3 PowerBook Mac laptop computers

Classroom equipment installed:

JGH 109 – Hitachi Star Panel, IBM Think Center Desktop, JVC DVD/VCR, Sound System, Lectern and data projector.

JGH 113 – Hitachi Star Panel, IBM Think Center Desktop, JVC DVD/VCR, Sound System, Lectern and data projector.

JGH 114 – Hitachi Star Panel, IBM Think Center Desktop, JVC DVD/VCR, Sound System, Lectern and data projector.

JGH 201 – Hitachi Star Panel, IBM Think Center Desktop, JVC DVD/VCR, Sound System, Lectern and data projector.

JGH 214 – Hitachi Star Panel, IBM Think Center Desktop, JVC DVD/VCR, Sound System, Lectern and data projector.

JGH 217 – Hitachi Star Panel, IBM Think Center Desktop, JVC DVD/VCR, Sound System, Lectern and data projector.

JGH 300 – All of the equipment has been replaced and a digital recording system was installed for students to download classes to computers and iPODS. AMX System was taken out completely.

IC 318 – Data projector and cabling.

LAB 108 – There are plans to re-furbish this room in the 2007/2008 budget year. Crestron System will be taken out, the lectern will be replaced and a new data projector will be installed. If we were not able to replace equipment during aforementioned year, funds will be requested for the following budget year.

LAB 209 – Data projector and cabling.

Equipment Housed in Buildings on Carts:

JGH MIS Dept—	2 roll-around multimedia carts, data/video projector, VCR, speaker and computer
JGH Acctg Dept—	3 roll-around multimedia carts, data/video projector, VCR, speaker and computer
OMH PSY Dept—	1 roll-around multimedia cart, data/video projector, VCR, speaker and computer
JST 503—	1 color LCD panel and overhead projector, roll-around multimedia cart and computer
WSB 229—	2 color LCD panel, overhead and computer
HPR—	2 data/video projectors, VCR, speaker, small cart and computer
Kelly Hall—	1 data/video projector, small cart, and computer
Cook Library—	2 data/video projectors, LCD panel and carts
Southern Hall 309-	3 data/video projectors
Campus-wide	100 new overhead projectors should be placed in classrooms by July 1, 2006

Computer Labs

The unrestricted open labs that are currently available to faculty, staff and students throughout the Gulf Coast and Hattiesburg Campuses are listed below:

Gulf Coast Campus Labs

Location/Lab	Printers	# of Stations	Software
GCSSC 123 GCSSC 130	HP 4350 HP 4350	18 22	Diet analysis Hesi Test MS Office XP 2003 Inspiration Graphic Organizers Kidspiration Graphic Organizers Arena 7.1 Visual Basic 6.0 Visual C++ 6.0 Visual Studio.net ArcGIS Map SPSS 13 Internet Applications
GCRL	HP 4240	24	MS Office XP 2003 SPSS 13 Internet Applications
Jackson Co	HP 4350	28	MS Office XP 2003 Frontpage Inspiration Kidspiration Arena 7.1 SPSS 13 Visual Basic
Keesler	No Southern Miss Lab		
Stennis	No Southern Miss Lab		

Hattiesburg

Open Labs

Location/Lab	Printers	# of Stations	Software
OMH 131	HP 8000 Laser Printer	22 Dell Optiplex PCs	MS Office XP, SPSS 13.0, Diet Analysis, Internet applications, AutoCAD
LAB 109	HP 8150 Laser Printer	22 IBM PCs	MS Office XP, STATA 9 (Data Analysis Software), Internet applications
COOK 105A	HP 3800 Color Laser Printer, HP 8150 Laser Printer	48 IBM PCs, 5 Apple eMacs, 4 Stations reserved for ADA	MS Office XP, SPSS 12.0, Internet applications, Jawbone for Windows *, Dragon Naturally Speaking *, Zoom Text*, Arkenstone Open Book*. Aurora Suite * * = only on the 4 stations which are reserved as ADA

The labs which are administered jointly as a partnership between iTech and a department are listed below:

Shared or Department Labs

Location/Lab	Printers	# of Stations	Software
SRS 105	Kyocera 3800 Laser Printer	15 Dell Optiplex PCs	MS Office XP, Internet applications
PAYNE 212	None	8 Gateway PCs	MS Office XP, Internet Applications
AKH 108	HP DesignJet 750 c 36" Plotter, HP color LaserJet 8500n	30 Dell Optiplex PCs	MS Office XP, SPSS 13.0, AutoCAD, Internet applications, ESRI
LAB 109	HP 8150 Laser Printer	22 IBM PCs	MS Office XP, STATA 9 (Data Analysis Software), Internet applications
TEC 233	HP LaserJet 4	30 PCs	MS Office, AutoCAD

Distance Education and Alternative Learning (DEAL)

The Distance Education and Alternative Learning (DEAL) [http://www.usm.edu/deal/] is a branch of the Office of the Provost and reports directly to the Provost. Its intent is to assist the colleges in providing quality distance learning to the various communities of learners that The University of Southern Mississippi supports.

The Office of Distance Education and Alternative Learning is guided by the Distance Education Committee. The Distance Education Committee is made up of faculty, administrators, and staff involved in distance education activities. DEAL encompasses Online Learning, IVN, Independent Study, and Mini Session.

WebCT

The Web Course Tools (WebCT) is used to deliver both online learning and course supplements to face-to-face learning. The WebCT staff place the course/course supplement templates online so that faculty members can create the course content. The WebCT, LEC and HELP DESK staff troubleshoot WebCT problems reported by the faculty, staff and students.

Interactive Video Network (IVN) Resources Currently/Formerly Available:

Gulf Coast IVN Room Configurations/Status:

Gulf Coast Student Service Center (GCSSC), Room 134-A – (Equipment List: Polycom iPower system, laptop computer available on request and document camera)

Jackson County USM Center, Room 214 – (Equipment List: Polycom iPower system, laptop computer for PowerPoint and Internet connection, fax/phone, VCR/DVD, ELMO visual presenter, and a data projector with large multi-media screen)

Stennis Space Center (SSC), Building 1022, Room 112 – (Equipment List: Polycom iPower system, VCR/DVD, visual presenter, data projector, phone/fax, laptop computer)

Gulf Park Advanced Education Center (AEC), Room 303 –This room was in operation until August 29, 2006, when Hurricane Katrina destroyed it.

Gulf Park Advanced Education Center (AEC), Room 307 –This room was in operation until August 29, 2006, when Hurricane Katrina destroyed it.

Gulf Park Advanced Education Center (AEC), Room 309– This room was in operation until August 29, 2006, when Hurricane Katrina destroyed it.

Jackson County USM Center, Room 218 – This room is not currently in use.

Gulf Coast Research Laboratory (GCRL), Computer Lab - This room was in operation until August 29, 2006 when Hurricane Katrina destroyed it.

Hattiesburg IVN Room Configurations/Status:

Hattiesburg Owings McQuagge Hall (OMH), Room 102- (Equipment list: Polycom iPower system, IBM laptop computer for PowerPoint and Internet connection, phone/fax, copier, VCR/DVD player, ELMO visual presenter, data projector with large multi-media screen, conference phone)

Hattiesburg Joseph Green Hall (JGH), Room 203- (Equipment list: Polycom iPower system, IBM laptop computer for PowerPoint and Internet connection, phone, fax, copier, VCR/DVD player, ELMO visual presenter, data projector with large multi-media screen, conference phone) This room is currently out of commission due to construction in the building. It will be back in operation in the spring semester of 2007.

Hattiesburg International Center (IC), Room 316- This room has a VTEL unit that is no longer used as classroom system. It is a small conference room now used for point-to-point meetings that do not require a VCR, a computer, or a visual presenter. For example, if a faculty or staff member wanted to meet with a colleague at one of the Gulf Coast campuses for a 30 minute meeting but wanted to avoid the drive to that campus, a virtual meeting could be scheduled in this room.

Independent Study

Independent study-type programming is being discontinued at The University of Southern Mississippi for both the high school [http://www.usm.edu/deal/is/is_highschool_credit.php] and the university levels [http://www.usm.edu/deal/is/is_university_credit.php]. Approximately 34 university courses and 45 high school courses were offered from 2004-2006.

Mini-Session

Mini Session is the time between semesters when regular session courses are not meeting. We often call this “semester break” or “intersession.” In order to better meet the flexible learning needs of students at Southern Miss, academic for-credit classes have been offered since January, 2006..

Learning Enhancement Center (LEC)

The mission of the Learning Enhancement Center [http://www.usm.edu/lec/] is to assist in the teaching and learning transaction by providing quality professional staff that collaborate with faculty, students, and staff to improve instruction and learning. Located in the International Center, (IC), Suite 315, the Learning Enhancement Center (LEC) is open during University operation hours, 8am-5pm, Monday through Friday.

The LEC is available to all faculty, students, and staff for technology-related professional development training and learning opportunities. Due to training sessions and open lab, one-on-one assistance and self-practice sessions are available by appointment only.

The LEC offers 10 Windows and 2 Macintosh-based workstations with the following software:

- Windows XP (OS 10.2 for Macintosh)
- Macromedia Dreamweaver MX 2004
- Adobe Photoshop CS
- MS Office Suite (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Access)
- Netscape Composer
- Impatica on Cue
- Camtasia
- Snag-it
- WS-FTP and Putty SSH
- Wireless Internet Access

A complete set of smart classroom (HVUC) equipment is available for training and self-practice sessions. The standard equipment set for the classrooms includes:

- SMART® Sympodium lectern*
- Windows-based PC
- Video data projector
- DVD-VCR combo unit with complete audio system
- ELMO visual presenter
- Presentation remote control system
- Projection screen

*The SMART® Sympodium is the latest state-of-the-art interactive lectern integration module that allows faculty to write notes, annotate over applications, present multimedia and save their work in a single file, all from one interactive screen. Southern Miss is a pioneer in Sympodium use in its classrooms.

LEC services include:

* One-on-one training

* Instructional design and course redesign

* WebCT training and online course design and development

* Technology classroom design and equipment consultation

* Research and communication of emerging educational technology

* SMART classroom design and equipment consultation

* SMART classroom equipment and software training

* Emerging technologies/Technology Fair

* Curriculum Development

* Faculty Development/Expanding Excellence training series

The **Expanding Excellence series** is a joint effort by the Learning Enhancement Center and iTech. Its purpose is to draw attention to existing programs on campus that offer development opportunities to faculty and staff in the areas of teaching and technology, and supplement these programs with additional workshops, lectures, or training sessions. The Expanding Excellence series is a year-round, ongoing effort at Southern Miss.

How did Expanding Excellence get started?

During the first half of 1997 there were a number of groups on campus focusing on the need for faculty development programs, staff training in technology, and workshops in instructional resources, including the Faculty Senate, the Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable (TLTR), the University Libraries, and the newly formed Office of Technology Resources, now known as iTech. Specific ideas for Expanding Excellence came from Southern Miss. faculty and staff through a Planning Survey done by a TLTR committee.

Who does Expanding Excellence benefit?

Potentially everyone at Southern Miss will benefit. Faculty and staff will both benefit from having better knowledge of what sort of training is available (or can be arranged) for software products or hardware, from word processing to creation of multimedia materials. Anyone involved in instruction will benefit from discussions and workshops on teaching or learning styles, instructional technology, or other education-related issues. Students will ultimately benefit from having faculty and staff with expanded knowledge

and abilities deliver services and instruction to them. Students may also enroll in Expanding Excellence classes on a space-available basis. Brown Bags and presentations are delivered to Southern Miss faculty and staff largely by other Southern Miss faculty and staff.

How can I participate in Expanding Excellence?

Anyone is welcome to attend an Expanding Excellence program — just sign up! The only exceptions may be hands-on training sessions where advance registration and limited numbers are necessary for space purposes. If you would be willing to share your experience with instructional issues or projects, or technology training, Let us know! Contact the Learning Enhancement Center at 266-5518.

How can I receive updates on activities?

Visit the LEC webpage at http://www.usm.edu/lec or call 266-5188.

Schedules of available programs and online registration can be found on the Expanding Excellence website at www.usm.edu/ee. As additional programs are added during the course of a semester you can retrieve information about them at the website.

LEC Online Training Materials:

LEC Training Materials

You must have Adobe Acrobat installed to view these materials.

Access 2003

- Introduction to Access

Camtasia 3.1

- Introduction to Camtasia 3.1
- Camtasia Quick Steps

Dreamweaver MX 2004

- Dreamweaver I
  - Dreamweaver I Practice Exercise
- Dreamweaver II
  - Dreamweaver II Practice Exercise
- Dreamweaver III

Excel 2003

- Introduction to Excel
- Intermediate Excel
    - Excel Intermediate Practice Exercise
- Pivot Tables in Excel

Hitachi Star Panel (Joseph Green Hall Faculty)

- Hitachi Star Panel User Guide

Impatica for PowerPoint

- Introduction to Impatica for PowerPoint

Mail Merge (MS Office 2003)

- Mail Merge Basics

Photoshop CS

- Photoshop I
- Photoshop II - Photoshop for the Web
    - Basic Logo Creation in Photoshop

PowerPoint 2003

- Introduction to PowerPoint
    - PowerPoint Introduction Practice Exercise
- Intermediate PowerPoint
- Advanced PowerPoint
- Design Tips for PowerPoint

Publisher 2003

- Introduction to Publisher

SMART Sympodium and SMART Classroom - Video Tutorials

- SMART Sympodium User Guide
- SMART Sympodium Startup Guide
- SMART Sympodium Troubleshooter
- SMART Software
- Stout Hall B Classroom Technology Guide

Snag-It 6.0

- Introduction to Snag-It 6.0

WebCT CE 4.1 - Video Tutorials

- WebCT 101
  - File Movement Graphic
  - WebCT Glossary
- WebCT - Managing Course Content
  - Uploading Files to WebCT
  - Adding a Page or Tool to WebCT
  - Adding Files to WebCT
  - Creating, Zipping, and Uploading HTML Files To WebCT From MS Word
- WebCT Quizzing and Surveys
- WebCT Communication Tools
- WebCT - Multimedia Development and Addition
  - Multimedia Glossary
- WebCT - Using the WebCT Gradebook
- WebCT - Downloading Grades from WebCT to Excel
- WebCT - Creating a Backup File of Your Online Course

Windows XP

- Basic File Management in Windows XP

Word 2003

- Introduction to Word
  - Introduction to Word Practice Guide
- Intermediate Word - Using Styles

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUCs)

The Title III-A strategic grant plan called for the identification of "highly visible undergraduate classrooms" (HVUCs) intended to improve academic programs. The HVUCs are defined as classrooms in which large or popular undergraduate courses are taught. The equipment to be installed in the HVUCs was identified from the faculty technology survey, loaner pool requests, and check-out information. An ad hoc committee polled chairs and faculty for a HVUCs list. A total of 38 classrooms were identified, with the implementation to spread over a period of three years. The other strategies for equipment acquisition included staff and faculty exposure to emerging technologies, faculty training, and evaluation of faculty satisfaction of the HVUCs. Of the 40 HVUCs set up, only 36 still exist. Hurricane Katrina destroyed the 3 Gulf Park and the 1 GCRL HVUCs.

During the final year of the grant, 10 smaller-scale multimedia classrooms will be created in College Hall, which will include: video data projectors and screens with cable for connecting laptops. These rooms include: CH 100, CH 102, CH 103, CH 110, CH 113, CH 200, CH 203, CH 208, CH 301, and CH 308. Additionally, Stout Hall A and B will be outfitted with video data projectors and DVD players.

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Master List

http://www.usm.edu/lec/HVUC_list.html

Year 3 (2004)	**12 Hattiesburg**	**1 GCRL**	
Building	**Room**	**Campus**	**Dept**
JGH	115	H	Business
FG	207	H	Social Work
SRS	202	H	Speech & Hearing Sc
SH	215	H	Mass Comm.
TEC	411	H	Chemistry
SH	119	H	Mass Comm.
**WSB	153	H	Biological Sc
**WSB	138	H	Biological Sc
PAYN	202	H	HPR
SRS	101	H	CISE
SRS	200	H	CISE
OMH	105	H	Ed/Psych
Caylor	104	GCRL	GCRL

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Master List
http://www.usm.edu/lec/HVUC_list.html

Year 2 (2003)	11 Hattiesburg	1 LEC	2 Gulf Park
LAB	103	H	Political Science
LAB	203	H	English
LAB	204	H	Anthro/Sociology
JGH	218	H	Econ/Finance/Business
OMH	109	H	Teacher Education
HPR	203	H	HPR
FG	112	H	Dietetics
FG	109	H	Child & Family St.
TAD	124	H	Theater & Dance
WSB	150	H	Biological Sciences
PSRC	105	H	Polymer Science
OMH	103	H	LEC
AEC	108	GP	Nursing
AEC	104	GP	Business

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Master List

http://www.usm.edu/lec/HVUC_list.html

Year 1 (2002)	**12 Hattiesburg**	**1 Gulf Park**	
Building	**Room**	**Campus**	**Dept**
LLOYD	308	GP	Biology/Marine Sc
*SH	303	H	Math
WS	150	H	Biological Sciences
NUR	101	H	Nursing
JGH	212	H	Management
OMH	125	H	Psychology
GHB	113	H	Art
PAC	109	H	Music
AKH	124	H	Geography
HPR	202	H	HPR
LAB	101	H	History
LAB	102	H	History
SRS	142	H	Elementary Education
	*Data projector and screen only	** HVUC equipment plus digital camera/color video camera to support scientific needs	

Campus Infrastructure-Networking

Purpose and Objectives:

- "Better" the wireless network service to campus
    - Obtain and follow a certified campus wireless design (site surveys).
    - Replace the antiquated wireless hardware.
        - From a 802.11b network to 802.11a/g network
        - Better access points
        - New wiring
    - Staging, configuring, and deploying new technology
- Decrease wireless work orders coming into the HELPDesk
- Improve resource time allocation for wireless network support and maintenance.
- Increase wireless subscription.

Table 9 below indicates the status of the current campus infrastructure networking projects:

Table 12: Status of the Campus Infrastructure-Networking Projects

Building	Status	Estimated Work/ Completion Date
1-Elam Arms	**Complete**	**Dec. 5-9, 2005**
2- McCarthy Hall and partially on Bond Hall	**Complete**	**Dec. 12-16, 2005**
3-Bond Hall	**Complete**	**Dec. 19-23, 2005**
4-Scott Hall	**Compete**	**Jan. 17-20, 2006**
5-Vann Hall	**Complete**	**Jan. 23-27, 2006**
6-Bolton, Jones, and Pulley Halls	**Complete**	**Jan. 30-Feb. 3, 2006**
7-Wilber Hall	**Complete**	**Feb. 6-10, 2006**
8-Roberts and partially on Hickman Hall	**Complete**	**Feb. 13-17, 2006**
9-Hickman and Mississippi Halls	**Complete**	**Feb. 20-24, 2006**
10-Hattiesburg Hall	**Complete**	**Feb. 27-March 3, 2006**
11-Alumni and Honors Houses, University Clinic, and partially on Kennard-Washington Hall	**Complete**	**March 4-10, 2006**
12-Kennard-Washington Hall, McLemore Hall, and partially on Hillcrest	**Complete**	**March 13-17, 2006**
13-Hillcrest	**Complete**	**March 20-25, 2006**
14-Southern and George Hurst Halls	**Complete**	**March 26-31, 2006**
15-HTP and West Football Stadium	**Complete**	**April 3-9, 2006**
16-Fine Arts Building and Field House	**Complete**	**April 10-13, 2006**

Building	Status	Estimated Work/ Completion Date
17-Field House and half of PowerHouse Restaurant	Complete	April 10-13; 17, 2006
18-Administration Building and Performing Arts Center	Complete	April 17-21, 2006
19-College Hall	Complete	April 24-28, 2006
20-Half of McCain Library and Archives	Complete	June 5-7, 2006
21-Finish McCain Lib./Archives	Complete	June 14-15, 2006
22-Owens McQuagge Hall	Complete	June 16-18, 2006
23-Home Economics and Walker Science	Complete	June 19-23, 2006
24- Joseph Green Hall	Future	Undetermined
25-3-D Arts	Future	Undetermined
26-Coliseum	Future	Undetermined
27-Cook Library	Future	Undetermined
28-Johnson Science Tower	Future	Undetermined
29-Liberal Arts Building	Future	Undetermined
30-Nursing Building	Future	Undetermined
31-Payne Center	Future	Undetermined
32-Polymer Science Research	Future	Undetermined
33-Speech and Hearing	Future	Undetermined
34-Theatre and Dance	Future	Undetermined
35-Chain Technology Center	Future	Undetermined
36-Ticket Office	Future	Undetermined
37- Textbook Center	Future	Undetermined
38-Forrest County Hall	Future	Undetermined

Utilization Rate of Technology Resources Available at Southern Miss

HELP DESK Utilization Rate

Calls:
07/05 to 12/05 -21,857
01/06 to 07/06 -27,274

Work Orders Completed:
10/04 to 07/06 -91,740

SOAR/SOARFIN Utilization Rate

Academic Use:

Year	Successful Attempts*	Total Attempts*
2004	749,572**	952,092**
2005	830,829	1,146,408
2006	1,251,160***	1,747,250***

*Not un-duplicated
**March-December, 2004
***January-June, 2006

Financial Use:

Year	Successful Attempts*	Total Attempts*
2004	unavailable	unavailable
2005	280,369**	282,203**
2006	208,632***	217,347***

*Not un-duplicated
**April-December, 2005
***January-June, 2006

Computer Labs

Gulf Coast

2004-2005 (prior to the destruction by Hurricane Katrina)
Cox Library-31,000*

2005 (post Katrina) – 2006
The number of faculty, staff, and students who have used the labs listed below when classes were not in session [including the computers in the hall of the GCSSC supported by the Cox Library] has not been tracked.

GCSSC Lab 123 B – 9 classes with 94 students enrolled
GCSSC Lab 130 – 12 classes with 136 students enrolled
Jackson County Lab – 5 classes with 55 students enrolled

Hattiesburg

2003-2004
OMH 131 – 35,528*
COOK 105A – 148,548*
LAB 109 – 25,360*

2004-2005
OMH 131 – 21,804*
COOK 105A – 104,799*
LAB 109 – 27,210*

2005-2006
OMH 131 – 20,637*
COOK 105A – 129,025*
LAB 109 – 24,189*

***user card swipes (not un-duplicated)**

Interactive Video Network (IVN) Utilization Rate on the Gulf Coast and in Hattiesburg

Academic courses, faculty/staff meetings, dissertation proposal and final defenses, workshops and conferences have been transmitted via the Interactive Video Network (IVN) since the spring of 1994. From that beginning until the spring of 2006, 675 academic courses have been delivered during weekday sessions through the IVN system, serving approximately 10,306 students enrolled in Hattiesburg and 8,192 students enrolled at remote sites (totaling 18,659) Additionally, nursing classes are delivered between Hattiesburg, the Gulf Coast, and Meridian during weekend sessions.

Distance Education and Alternative Learning (DEAL) Utilization Rate:

WebCT Support for Faculty, Staff, and Students from Fall 2005-Spring 2006:
Fall 2005: 909 calls
Spr 2006: 1117 calls

WebCT Course Supplement Enrollment from Fall 2003-Spring 2006
Fall 2006: 321 classes with 905 enrolled
Spr 2006: 254 classes with 8,211 enrolled

Online Course Enrollment from Fall 2003-Spring 2006

Fall	2003:	144 classes with 3459 enrolled
Spr	2004:	151 classes with 3787 enrolled
Fall	2004:	146 classes with 3455 enrolled
Spr	2005:	135 classes with 3710 enrolled
Fall	2006:	154 classes with 3490 enrolled
Spr	2006:	148 classes with 3381 enrolled

Mini Session Enrollment from Spring 2006

Spr	2006:	24 classes with 376 students enrolled

Learning Enhancement Center (LEC) Utilization Rate:

All Expanding Excellence (EE) Training, 2004-2006

Students enrolled: 2351

Students attended: 1980

All Web Course Tools (WebCT) Training, 2004-2006

Students enrolled: 437

Students attended: 350

All SMART Sympodium (required for HVUC room use) Training, 2004-2006

Students enrolled: 264

Students attended: 339

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Utilization Rate:

Spr	2004:	345 classes with 11,978 enrolled
Sum	2004:	181 classes with 3,176 enrolled
Fall	2004:	357 classes with 13,312 enrolled
Spr	2005:	362 classes with 12,361 enrolled
Sum	2005:	212 classes with 3,924 enrolled
Fall	2005:	371 classes with 14,988 enrolled
Spr	2006:	393 classes with 14,219 enrolled

Appendix C

2001-2006 Faculty Technology Survey Instruments

2001 Technology Survey Instrument

USM Technology Survey
Faculty and Administrators

Please respond to these statements by marking your answers on the enclosed Scantron sheet, using the following scale:

0 Not Applicable
1 Strongly Disagree
2 Somewhat Disagree
3 Neither Agree or Disagree
4 Somewhat Agree
5 Strongly Agree

(1) There are no barriers to my using the applications and media I would like to use.

I do not use the applications and media I would like to use because:

(2) I do not have the time.
(3) I have not acquired the necessary skills.
(4) I do not have technical support on campus.
(5) I do not have on-site (e.g., classroom, lab) support.
(6) I do not know how to incorporate technology into my classes.
(7) It is too expensive.
(8) I do not know how to get access.
(9) I need upgraded hardware.
(10) The technology is not available in my classroom.

I do not use the applications and media I would like to use because

(11) The applications and media do not run on machines in the computing sites.
(12) I am not sure how to legally use copyrighted materials.
(13) It is too much trouble.
(14) I do not have departmental funds to pay software costs.

(15) There is no incentive program (e.g., leave time, contribution toward tenure, financial rewards).
(16) I am better able to use information technology now than I was two years ago.
(17)I am able to do everything I need to/want to using Southern Miss information technology resources.
(18)I am able to access all Southern Miss computing resources I need from my office.
(19) I am able to access all Southern Miss computing resources I need from my home.
(20) I have all the technological facilities I need in the classrooms I use.
(21) I do not need any technological facilities in the classrooms I use.

In the classrooms I use, I need but do not have:

(22) Internet access
(23) Network connections
(24) Computer projection capabilities
(25) A lapel microphone
(26) Electronic pointers
(27) Student computers
(28) Instructor's computer station

(29) I have attempted to reserve a multimedia classroom during the past year.

(30) I am always able to reserve a multimedia classroom with no problems.

When using a multimedia classroom on campus, I have encountered no problems with

(31) The equipment
(32) The room's physical environment
(33) On-site technical support

(34) I am very familiar with the information technology resources on campus.

(35) Southern Miss' information technology resources meet my needs very adequately.

(36) Southern Miss' information technology support services have been very helpful and responsive to my needs.

If I could easily obtain support and services, I would very much want to:

(37) Use a Web page with course materials

(38) Use an e-mail list of students in my class

(39) Use a class electronic bulletin board/forum on the Web

(40) Use audio/video clips, animation, or slides

(41) Use streaming video

(42) Use self-paced practice and tests of routine tasks

(43) Use computer simulations

(44) Use self-paced tutorials with audio/video clips

(45) Use multimedia presentations

(46) Use the Web to conduct research

(47) Use the Web to present work to other people at USM

(48) Use the Web to present work to people around the world

(49)Use the Web to conduct simulations or visualizations

(50) Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people at USM

(51)Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world

(52) Use the Web to gather information via online quizzes, etc.

(53)Use the Web for online materials archives

(54) Use the Web for online course reserves

(55) Use the Web for online course delivery
(56) Are you an officially designated Professional Education Faculty (PEF) member? (PEF teach one or more professional education courses and/or have official advising responsibilities or professional education students.)

Yes = 1 No = 2

2004 Technology Survey Instrument

Southern Miss Technology Survey
Faculty and Administrators

Instructions for completion of survey in PENCIL ONLY

In the lower left section of the Scantron sheet, please fill in the following information

1. BIRTH DATE – Please indicate the year you were born in the "**YR**" column
2. IDENTIFICATION NUMBER – Enter the numeric codes for departments under columns **A** – **C** (Please refer to annexure 1 for Department Codes)
3. IDENTIFICATION NUMBER – Enter the numeric code of the college your department is affiliated to in columns **D** – **F** (Please refer to annexure 1 for College Codes)
4. SPECIAL CODES – Enter the numeric code of the campus your department belongs to in columns **K** – **M** (Please refer to annexure 1 for Campus Codes)
5. SEX – Please fill in the bubble for the appropriate sex
6. In the GRADE column, please indicate your GRADE: 1 = Instructor, 2 = Assist. Professor, 3 = Assoc. Professor, 4 = Professor

Please respond to these statements by making your answers on the enclosed Scantron sheet, using the [appropriate] scale.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neither Agree or Disagree	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

(1) There are no barriers to my using the applications and media I would like to use.

I do not use the applications and media I would like to use because: **(Q2 to 16)**

(2) I do not have the time.
(3) I have not acquired the necessary skills.
(4) I do not have technical support on campus.
(5) I do not have on-site (e.g., classroom, lab) support.
(6) I do not know how to incorporate technology into my classes.
(7) It is too expensive.
(8) I do not know how to get access.
(9) I need upgraded hardware.
(10) The technology is not available in my classroom.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neither Agree or Disagree	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

I do not use the applications and media I would like to use because

(11) The applications and media do not run on machines in the computing sites.
(12) I am not sure how to legally use copyrighted materials.
(13) It is too much trouble.
(14) I do not have departmental funds to pay software costs.
(15) There is no incentive program (e.g., leave time, contribution toward tenure, financial rewards).
(16) The cost of the software applications that I use for instruction is high.
(17) I am better able to use information technology now than I was two years ago.
(18) I am able to do everything I need to/want to using Southern Miss information technology resources.
(19) I am able to access all Southern Miss computing resources I need from my office.
(20) I am able to access all Southern Miss computing resources I need from my home.
(21) I have all the technological facilities I need in the classrooms I use.
(22) I do not need any technological facilities in the classrooms I use.

In the classrooms I use, I need but do not have: (**Q.23 to 30)**

(23) Internet access
(24) Network connections
(25) Computer projection capabilities
(26) A lapel microphone
(27) Electronic pointers
(28) Student computers
(29) Instructor's computer station
(30) Audio and Video capabilities

(31) I have attempted to reserve a multimedia classroom during the past year.

(32) I am always able to reserve a multimedia classroom with no problems.

When using a multimedia classroom on campus, I have encountered no problems with

(33) The equipment
(34) The room's physical environment
(35) On-site technical support

(36) I am very familiar with the information technology resources on campus.

(37) Southern Miss' information technology resources meet my needs very adequately.

(38) Southern Miss' information technology support services have been very helpful and responsive to my needs.

Please note there are <u>two</u> questions in each row (questions 39 through 76). Please answer both the questions.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neither Agree or Disagree	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

If I could easily obtain support and services	I would very much want to	Existing training support meets my requirements
Use a Web page with course materials	(39)	(40)
Use an e-mail list of students in my class	(41)	(42)
Use a class electronic bulletin board/forum on the Web	(43)	(44)
Use audio/video clips, animation, or slides	(45)	(46)
Use streaming video	(47)	(48)
Use self-paced practice and tests of routine tasks	(49)	(50)
Use computer simulations	(51)	(52)
Use self-paced tutorials with audio/video clips	(53)	(54)
Use multimedia presentations	(55)	(56)
Use the Web to conduct research	(57)	(58)
Use the Web to present work to other people at Southern Miss	(59)	(60)
Use the Web to present work to people around the world	(61)	(62)
Use the Web to conduct simulations or visualizations	(63)	(64)
Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people at Southern Miss	(65)	(66)

Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world	(67)	(68)
Use the Web to gather information via online quizzes, etc.	(69)	(70)
Use the Web for online materials archives	(71)	(72)
Use the Web for online course reserves	(73)	(74)
Use the Web for online course delivery	(75)	(76)

Please note there are <u>two</u> questions in each row (questions 77 through 106). Please answer both the questions.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neither Agree or Disagree	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

Please indicate your skill levels and use of the following information technology resources	Skill	Use
WEBCT	(77)	(78)
LISTSERV	(79)	(80)
Web Designing software (Dream Weaver, Composer, others)	(81)	(82)
Microsoft Word	(83)	(84)
Microsoft Excel	(85)	(86)
PowerPoint	(87)	(88)
Microsoft Access	(89)	(90)
Microsoft Photoshop	(91)	(92)
Adobe Distiller (for creating PDF documents)	(93)	(94)
Adobe Page Maker	(95)	(96)
Adobe Illustrator	(97)	(98)
Quick Time Movies	(99)	(100)
Equipments in Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms	(101)	(102)

Using a data projector with laptop/computer/television	(103)	(104)
Using SPSS	(105)	(106)

(107) Did you take this survey in August 2001 when it was first administered?

Yes = 1 No = 2

(108) Have you been employed by The University of Southern Mississippi since August 2001, or have you been promoted from a staff or student position to a faculty position since August 2001?

Yes = 1 No = 2

(109) Are you an officially designated Professional Education Faculty (PEF) member? (PEF teach one or more professional education courses and/or have official advising responsibilities or professional education students.)

Yes = 1 No = 2

2006 Technology Survey Instrument

Southern Miss Technology Survey
Faculty and Administrators

Instructions for completion of survey in PENCIL ONLY

In the lower left section of the Scantron sheet, please fill in the following information

7. BIRTH DATE – Please indicate the year you were born in the "**YR**" column
8. IDENTIFICATION NUMBER – Enter the numeric codes for departments under columns **A** – **C** (Please refer to annexure 1 for Department Codes)
9. SPECIAL CODES – Enter the numeric code of the campus your department belongs to in columns **D** – **F** (Please refer to annexure 1 for Campus Codes)
10. SEX – Please fill in the bubble for the appropriate sex
11. In the GRADE column, please indicate your GRADE: 1 = Instructor, 2 = Visiting Professor, 3= Adjunct/Part-time Professor, 4 = Assist. Professor, 5 = Assoc. Professor, 6 = Professor

Please respond to these statements by making your answers on the enclosed Scantron sheet, using the [appropriate] scale.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neutral	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

(1) There are no barriers to my using the applications and media I would like to use.

I do not use the applications and media I would like to use because: **(Q2 to 16)**

(2) I do not have the time.
(3) I have not acquired the necessary skills.
(4) I do not have technical support on campus.
(5) I do not have on-site (e.g., classroom, lab) support.
(6) I do not know how to incorporate technology into my classes.
(7) It is too expensive.
(8) I do not know how to get access.
(9) I need upgraded hardware.
(10) The technology is not available in my classroom.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neutral	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

I do not use the applications and media I would like to use because

(11) The applications and media do not run on machines in the computing sites.
(12) I am not sure how to legally use copyrighted materials.
(13) It is too much trouble.
(14) I do not have departmental funds to pay software costs.
(15) There is no incentive program (e.g., leave time, contribution toward tenure, financial rewards).
(16) The cost of the software applications that I use for instruction is high.
(17) I am better able to use information technology now than I was five years ago.
(18) I am better able to use information technology now than I was two years ago.
(19) I am able to do everything I need to/want to do using Southern Miss information technology resources.
(20) I am able to access all Southern Miss computing resources I need from my office.
(21) I am able to access all Southern Miss computing resources I need from my home.
(22) I have all the technological facilities I need in the classrooms I use.
(23) I do not need any technological facilities in the classrooms I use.

In the classrooms I use, I need but do not have: (**Q.24 to 31)**

(24) Internet access
(25) Network connections
(26) Computer projection capabilities
(27) A lapel microphone
(28) Electronic pointers
(29) Student computers
(30) Instructor's computer station
(31) Audio and Video capabilities

(32) I have attempted to reserve a multimedia classroom during the past year.

(33) I am always able to reserve a multimedia classroom with no problems.

When using a multimedia classroom on campus, I have encountered no problems with

(34) The equipment
(35) The room's physical environment
(36) On-site technical support

(37) I am very familiar with the information technology resources on campus.

(38) Southern Miss' information technology resources meet my needs very adequately.

(39) Southern Miss' information technology support services have been very helpful and responsive to my needs.

Please note there are <u>two</u> questions in each row (questions 40 through 77). Please answer both the questions.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neutral	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

If I could easily obtain support and services	I would very much want to	Existing training support meets my requirements
Use a Web page with course materials	(40)	(41)
Use an e-mail list of students in my class	(42)	(43)
Use a class electronic bulletin board/forum on the Web	(44)	(45)
Use audio/video clips, animation, or slides	(46)	(47)
Use streaming video	(48)	(49)
Use self-paced practice and tests of routine tasks	(50)	(51)
Use computer simulations	(52)	(53)
Use self-paced tutorials with audio/video clips	(54)	(55)
Use multimedia presentations	(56)	(57)
Use the Web to conduct research	(58)	(59)
Use the Web to present work to other people at So Miss	(60)	(61)
Use the Web to present work to people around the world	(62)	(63)
Use the Web to conduct simulations or visualizations	(64)	(65)
Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people at So Miss	(66)	(67)

Use the Web to facilitate collaboration with people around the world	(68)	(69)
Use the Web to gather information via online quizzes, etc.	(70)	(71)
Use the Web for online materials archives	(72)	(73)
Use the Web for online course reserves	(74)	(75)
Use the Web for online course delivery	(76)	(77)

Please note there are <u>two</u> questions in each row (questions 78 through 107). Please answer both the questions.

0=Not Applicable	1=Strongly Disagree	2=Somewhat Disagree	3=Neither Agree or Disagree	4=Somewhat Agree	5=Strongly Agree

Please indicate your skill levels and use of the following information technology resources	Skill	Use
WEBCT	(78)	(79)
LISTSERV	(80)	(81)
Web Designing software (Dream Weaver, Composer, others)	(82)	(83)
Microsoft Word	(84)	(85)
Microsoft Excel	(86)	(87)
PowerPoint	(88)	(89)
Microsoft Access	(90)	(91)
Microsoft Photoshop	(92)	(93)
Adobe Distiller (for creating PDF documents)	(94)	(95)
Adobe Page Maker	(96)	(97)
Adobe Illustrator	(98)	(99)
Quick Time Movies	(100)	(101)
Equipments in Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms	(102)	(103)

Using a data projector with laptop/computer/television	(104)	(105)
Using SPSS	(106)	(107)

(108) Did you take this survey in August 2001 when it was first administered?

Yes = 1 No = 2

(109) Did you take this survey in January 2004, the second time it was administered?

Yes = 1 No = 2

(110) Have you been employed by The University of Southern Mississippi since January 2004, or have you been promoted from a staff or student position to a faculty position since January 2004?

Yes = 1 No = 2

(111) Are you an officially designated Professional Education Faculty (PEF) member? (PEF teach one or more professional education courses and/or have official advising responsibilities for professional education students.)

Yes = 1 No = 2

Special Thanks go to the following persons for their patient assistance in providing information or editorial assistance for this report:

Robin Blanchard
Valerie Craig
Derek Davis
Homer Coffman
Marlisa Fillingane-Northrup
Sherry Finneran
Mike Fulce
Dr. Clyde N. Ginn
Evelyn Green
Dr. Jay Grimes
Dr. Lin Harper
Joel Holder
Dr. J.T. Johnson
Robin Johnson
Chuck Knight
Dr. Cynthia Moore
Daneel Murphy
Sheri Rawls
Chad Seals
David Sliman
Trudy H. Stewart
Becky Thompson
Megan M. Tousignant
Casey Turnage